L.N.Suvorov

Marxist Philosophy at the Leninist Stage

L.N.Suvorov

MARXIST PHILOSOPHY AT THE LENINIST STAGE

Progress Publishers
Moscow

Translated from the Russian
Designed by *Vadim Kuleshov*

© Издательство «Прогресс», 1981

English translation © Progress Publishers 1982

Printed in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

$C\frac{10501\text{-}306}{014\ (01)82}\ 39\text{-}82$ 0301000000

CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	5
CHAPTER I The Essence of the Leninist Stage in the Development of Marxist Philosophy	14
1. The Origins of the Concept of the Leninist Stage in Marxist Philosophy	14
2. The Most Important Features of the Leninist Stage in Marxist Philosophy	21
CHAPTER II The Development of Marxist Philosophy by Lenin Before the October Revolution	33
1. The Struggle for a Party of a New Type	33
2. The Russian Revolution of 1905-1907	58
3. *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism*	67
4. The Struggle Against Revisionism and Bourgeois Philosophy	84
5. *Philosophical Notebooks*	88
6. The Era of Imperialism and Socialist Revolutions	106
CHAPTER III Philosophical Problems of Leninism After the October Revolution	133
1. Lenin and Soviet Philosophy	133
2. Lenin on the Scientific Management of Society	151
3. Philosophical Discussions of the 1920s	163
4. The Victory of Socialism in the USSR and Lenin's Philosophical Legacy	173
5. Lenin's Philosophical Ideas and the Present Time	181
CHAPTER IV The Current Ideological Struggle Over Lenin's Philosophical Legacy	200
1. Leninism and 20th-Century Bourgeois Philosophy	200
2. Leninism and Petty-Bourgeois Philosophical Currents	210
3. Leninism and the Philosophy of Social Reformism	221
4. Leninism and Modern Revisionism	228
CONCLUSION	240
BIBLIOGRAPHY	243

INTRODUCTION

Leonid Ilyich Brezhnev, General Secretary of the CC CPSU, said in the Report of the CC CPSU to the 26th Party Congress: "The twentieth century has brought with it more changes than any previous century. And no country has made a more tangible contribution to these changes than the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the homeland of the Great October Revolution, the first country of triumphant socialism. This is the seventh decade that its invincible Leninist banner has been held aloft."[1] These words capsulise the historical importance of Leninism for the contemporary epoch.

There were many brilliant philosophical and socio-political doctrines in the history of human thought. Their fate was different: some of them flashed brightly for a time, but soon fell into oblivion; others were not acclaimed by the contemporaries but won esteem later. Yet all of them were governed by a common law: as time passed, they lost their relevance.

Marxism-Leninism stands apart from all other doctrines and its destiny is different, too. With the passage of time, as humanity travels further and further from the moment this philosophy was proclaimed by Marx and Engels, its creative revolutionary role becomes ever greater. This has been confirmed beyond all doubt by the developments of the 20th century.

Leninism, which is Marxism of the 20th century, has

the same destiny. That is why the issue of the Leninist stage in the evolution of Marxist philosophy is very topical today. Lenin's philosophical teaching, enriched by his disciples, is now the only scientific trend in philosophy, the main stream in the development of Marxist philosophy, the Marxism of our age.

It is quite logical of course that the development of dialectical and historical materialism in the 20th century is associated with Lenin, and that it is called the Leninist stage of Marxist philosophy. For it is Lenin, the great successor to the cause of Marx and Engels, who initiated the modern stage in the development of Marxist theory. A Resolusion of the CPSU Central Committee, "On Preparations for the Centenary of the Birth of V. I. Lenin" pointed out: "The whole of modern history is closely linked to the name of Lenin. Lenin brilliantly developed the revolutionary teachings of Marx and Engels, founded the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, led the greatest social revolution, and built the first socialist state in the world. Lenin's ideas had and still have a most profound impact on the entire course of world development." [2]

The Address On the Centenary of the Birth of Vladimir Ilyich Lenin, adopted at the International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties held in Moscow in June 1969, stressed: "Today we have every justification for saying about Lenin's teaching what he himself said of Marxism: it is omniponent, because it is true." [3]

Recent congresses of the CPSU and other communist and workers' parties have again emphasised the great significance of Lenin's ideas for the world today and the importance and relevance of analysing and developing Lenin's theoretical heritage with regard to the world development as a whole, the struggle for peace and social progress and the building of developed socialism and communism in the countries of the world socialist community.

CPSU Central Committee theses, "On the Centenary of the Birth of Vladimir Ilyich Lenin", made the point that "Leninism is the methodology of revolutionary thought and revolutionary action for all Marxists-Leninists and all genuine revolutionaries". [4]

A CPSU Central Committee Resolution, "On the 110th Anniversary of the Birth of Vladimir Ilyich Lenin carries the words: "Lenin and the Bolshevik [5] Party carried out

the great mission of preparing and leading history's first victorious socialist revolution and combining the theory of scientific socialism with the broadest practice of the popular masses . . . Leninism is the Marxism of the present epoch, the single, integral and continually developing doctrine of the international working class." [6]

Describing the revolutionary essence of Leninism, Leonid Brezhnev said: "Lenin undeviatingly responded to Marx's call not only to *explain* but to *change* the world. Solving theoretical problems in close connection with practice, with the class struggle, was a quality of Lenin's genius which met the fundamental need of the revolutionary movement in the 20th century, when the proletarian revolution came on the order of the day." [7]

Loyalty to Leninist ideas is today the touchstone of loyalty to the cause of communism and the progressive development of mankind as a whole. Lenin's ideas ensure the only genuinely scientific approach to problems relating to the future of human society. This is why such an acute ideological struggle has flared up over the philosophical questions of Leninism.

All the attempts of our adversaries to distort or disparage the significance of Leninism are doomed to failure. The historical experience of the 20th century, and first of all the development of the USSR and the other socialist countries has brilliantly borne out the truth of Lenin's ideas. In our days Leninism is the recognised, tried and tested ideological weapon of all genuine revolutionaries, of all the disciples and successors to the great cause of the founders of the theory of scientific communism.

The growing strength and viability of Leninism is based on its close link with the practice of the world revolutionary process of our age. No other doctrine has been able to properly disclose and scientifically forecast the forms of the social progress of today. More and more working people all over the world are becoming convinced that only Marxism-Leninism can serve as a reliable guide in determining the correct way of the development of human society, that Marxism-Leninism alone can arm mankind ideologically in its struggle for peace, social progress and genuine justice.

The modern stage of world social development is determined by the interaction of three principal social forces.

The first is the world socialist community, comprising the countries and peoples that consciously follow the way charted by Marx and Lenin, the second is a large group of young national democratic states that have replaced the former imperialist colonies and semi-colonies in Asia, Africa and Latin America, and the third is the countries still under the sway of capitalism. Right back in the early years of Soviet power in Russia Lenin forecast this complex dialectic of social development in the 20th century. He formulated the main laws governing the transition from capitalism to socialism both in one country and on the international scene. He said that socialism was bound to become the most advanced force, determining the whole course of social development. Lenin worked out a doctrine on the basic laws of building socialism, i.e. the creation of a new material and technical basis higher than the capitalist one, the formation of new social relations and the emergence and development of a new socialist consciousness and culture. He also predicted the imminent collapse of the world colonial system of imperialism and the possibility of underdeveloped nations making a transition to socialism without going through the capitalist stage. As we know this tenet of Lenin's has been borne out in the anti-imperialist and democratic struggle waged by the oppressed peoples of Asia and Africa. Finally, dwelling on features of the class struggle in the capitalist countries, Lenin said that imperialism would increasingly lose its influence in the world and its links and internal reserves would increasingly wane as the working masses consolidated their forces and the internal contradictions in the capitalist world grew sharper. And this proposition has been fully confirmed in this century, with the economic, political and ideological contradictions between the propertied classes and the working majority becoming strained to the utmost in the so-called "democratic" capitalist countries—the USA, Britain, France, etc.

We have every justification for saying that Lenin's ideas on the development of human society in the present period of history have been fully confirmed by the entire social process of the 20th century. This is why Lenin's ideas are so viable today. In 1917, on the eve of the Great October Socialist Revolution, Lenin wrote: "The whole theory of Marx is the application of the theory of develop-

ment—in its most consistent, complete, considered and pithy form—to modern capitalism. Naturally, Marx was faced with the problem of applying this theory both to the *forthcoming* collapse of capitalism and to the *future* development of *future* communism." [8] This thesis is fully applicable to the work of Lenin himself. Indeed, all his writings and speeches, from the beginning of his struggle against the Liberal Narodism in 1893 and 1894, to his last articles written in 1923, are marked by his creative application of the militant method of the materialist dialectics to an analysis of the social processes in the epoch of imperialism and the proletarian revolutions of the 20th century. After the victory of the socialist revolution in Russia Lenin worked on bringing out the new conditions of world social development in general and in particular on drawing theoretical conclusions from the experience of the October Revolution of 1917 in Russia and the early years of Soviet power, and from the revolutionary movements and action in West European and Asian countries, where the October Revolution had awakened the revolutionary activity of various detachments in the nascent communist movement. Lenin also applied the Marxist method to analysis of conditions attending the forthcoming collapse of world capitalism and the development of the peoples' struggle for socialism and communism in the world today.

No other social problem in man's ideological life has been discussed so acutely in the 20th century as that of the historical destinies of Leninism, its theoretical and practical achievements. The most sophisticated and intricate contrivances of the adversaries of Leninism to distort, falsify or belittle the true significance of its ideas have been a complete fiasco. And conversely, the significance of Leninism and its prestige in the modern world are growing steadily and people engaged in science, literature and the arts, as well as revolutionary workers, are coming over to its side. This is because Leninism has a unique quality: its ideas, assessments and conclusions are not sterile, far-fetched abstractions, as various bourgeois and petty-bourgeois theories are. As it has developed, the Leninist theory has been fully confirmed by the practice of social development.

Thus, unlike the idealist and subjectivist theorists of Liberal Narodism [9] who preached the idea of some "special"

path that Russia would take to socialism, Lenin, in the first years of his political and theoretical activity maintained that the only direction for Russia's social development in the late 19th century which would meet the demands of reality was the formation of capitalist relations and sharp polarisation between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. As we know the course of events in the first decade of the 20th century fully bore out this conclusion.

In that period, Lenin worked against the opportunistic trend in international and Russian Social-Democracy, the so-called legal Marxists [10], the Economists [11] and Bernstein's followers. [12] In this struggle Lenin affirmed that Bernstein's supporters were unavoidably sliding to a position of apologising and defending capitalism. The subsequent history of the international working-class movement conclusively proved that Lenin was right.

In the struggle for a new type of party during the first Russian revolution (1905-1907) Lenin exposed Menshevism [13] in Social Democracy as a petty-bourgeois trend toward a compromise with the bourgeoisie. The revolution and the subsequent struggle against Liquidationism [14] showed that Lenin was right in his assessment of Menshevism. The subsequent history of the revolutionary movement finally exposed the counter-revolutionary essence of Menshevism as a petty-bourgeois trend. In the years of reaction that set in after the defeat of the 1905-1907 revolution, Lenin did a prodigious amount of work in the philosophical field, writing one of his chief books on philosophy, *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism*. It provides a systematic exposition of the main problems of dialectical materialism, reveals the essence of the theory of reflection, analyses Marxist principles for the criticism of idealism and metaphysics in bourgeois philosophy and gives a general Marxist philosophical view of the revolution in natural science at the turn of the century. The positions Lenin formulated in this work underlie the whole subsequent development of Marxist philosophy. At the same time, Lenin's criticism of Machism and of Bogdanov's revision of Marxism, [15] as well as his substantiation of the principle of the partisanship of philosophy, are the foundation for the ideological struggle conducted by Marxists-Leninists against bourgeois philosophy and revisionism.

During the new revolutionary upsurge and World War I

Lenin worked out the general theoretical problems of materialist dialectics and applied it to social development, creating his theory of imperialism and socialist revolution. He was the first to formulate the proposition that it was fundamentally possible for socialism to triumph initially in one country taken singly. On the eve of the October Revolution he wrote his important work *The State and Revolution,* which generalised from Marxist research on this problem, and which became the theoretical programme for preparing and carrying out the world's first proletarian revolution in Russia.

After the October Revolution, Lenin enriched Marxist philosophy with his teaching on the laws governing the transition from capitalism to socialism and set forth a science-based programme for the development of Marxist philosophy after the victory of the socialist revolution.

Lenin's theoretical activity was aimed at attaining a single aim—to give a theoretical analysis of philosophical problems whose solution was indispensable for the cause of the revolution. Lenin's solution of these problems moved the development of Marxist philosophy on to a new historical stage. The theoretical propositions he advanced found brilliant confirmation in the course of 20th-century social development. The work done by Lenin's followers and disciples in further analysing and giving concrete expression to his ideas, work done by the CPSU and other communist and workers' parties and reflected in their documents and decisions, as well as by the splendid cohort of Marxist philosophers fostered in the USSR according to Lenin's behests, and by many Marxist philosophers in the fraternal socialist countries and those belonging to communist parties in many capitalist and developing countries—this work is the logical continuation of the Leninist stage of Marxist philosophy.

This book aims to acquaint the reader with the basic historical landmarks in establishing and developing Lenin's philosophical ideas and with the major specific features of Marxist philosophy at the Leninist stage of development.

[1] L. I. Brezhnev, *Report of the Central Committee of the CPSU to the XXVI Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Immediate Tasks of the Party in Home and Foreign Policy,* Novosti Press Agency Publishing House, Moscow, 1981, p. 142.

[2] CPSU Central Committee Resolution "On Preparations for the Centenary of the Birth of V. I. Lenin", Moscow, 1968, p. 3 (in Russian).

[3] *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow, 1969.* Prague, Peace and Socialism Publishers, 1969, p. 41.

[4] *On the Centenary of the Birth of Vladimir Ilyich Lenin,* CPSU Central Committee Theses, Moscow, 1969, p. 5 (in Russian).

[5] *Bolsheviks*—the revolutionary wing of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party headed by Lenin from 1903 to 1912. The Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party (Bolsheviks) was formed in 1912. Later the Party was renamed the Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks), RCP(B), and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks), CPSU(B), Renamed in 1952 the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU).

[6] *On the 110th Anniversary of the Birth of Vladimir Ilyich Lenin.* Moscow 1979 p. 4 (in Russian).

[7] L. I. Brezhnev, *Following Lenin's Course. Speeches and Articles,* Moscow, Progress Publishers, 1972, p. 255.

[8] V. I. Lenin, "The State and Revolution", *Collected Works,* Vol. 25, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1977, pp. 457-58.

[9] *Narodism* (Populism)—an ideological and political trend among the liberal and revolutionary Russian intelligentsia between the 1870s and 1890s which expressed the interests of the emergent free peasantry (after the liberation of the peasants from serfdom in 1861). In the late 1870s, Narodism split into two branches, revolutionary and liberal. The Revolutionary Narodniks formed the Narodnaya Volya (People's Freedom) Party which attempted to fight tsarism with terrorism (the assassination of Tsar Alexander II in 1881 and a number of other terrorist acts in that period). The liberal wing formed the Chorny Peredel (Land Redivision) Party, which tried to enlighten the peasants and workers. In the 1890s, it became a spokesman for the interests of the rural bourgeoisie (the kulaks) and in the early 20th century served as the basis for a party of the Socialist-Revolutionaries.

[10] *"Legal Marxism"*—an ideological trend among the Russian bourgeois intelligentsia in the late 19th century. Its proponents recognised only Marx's economic theory and discarded his philosophical and political ideas. Later on they fused with the Constitutional-Democratic Party formed during the 1905 revolution.

[11] *The Economists*—Russian followers of Bernstein (see below). They advocated the theory of a spontaneous working-class movement and denied the need to struggle politically and ideologically against capitalism. Later on the leaders of the Economists joined the Constitutional-Democratic Party, one of the main parties representing the Russian bourgeoisie.

[12] *Bernsteinism*—a neo-Kantian revision of Marxism carried out in 1894-1899 by Eduard Bernstein, who expounded the basic ideas of this doctrine in his *Die Voraussetzungen des Sozialismus und die Aufgaben der Sozialdemokratie* (Prerequisites of Socialism and the Tasks of Social Democracy) written in the late 1890s. The doctrine was criticised and censured at a number of congresses of the Second International and also by Georgi Plekhanov, Karl Kautsky and

others. An in-depth analysis of Bernstein's views was provided by Lenin in his work *What Is to Be Done?* (1902).

[13] *Menshevism*—the right wing in Russian Social-Democracy which upheld opportunistic, conciliatory ideas. It expressed the interests of the "workers' aristocracy" and petty-bourgeois intellectuals. It actively struggled against Leninism and the Bolsheviks, was finally defeated during the October Revolution of 1917 and disintegrated in the 1920s.

[14] *Liquidationism*—a trend in the Menshevik wing of Russian Social-Democracy between 1906 and 1912. It advocated liquidating illegal forms of the working-class struggle, hence its name.

[15] *Bogdanov's revision of Marxism*—an ideological trend among the Russian Social-Democrats (Bolsheviks and Mensheviks) after the 1905 revolution, seeking to substitute positivism for dialectical materialism. It was called after its leader A. Bogdanov (Malinovsky) and was thoroughly criticised by Lenin in his *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism*.

CHAPTER I

The Essence of the Leninist Stage in the Development of Marxist Philosophy

1. The Origins of the Concept of the Leninist Stage in Marxist Philosophy

The concept of the Leninist stage in the Marxist philosophy was formulated by Soviet scholars after Lenin's death. Needless to say it did not take shape all at once. It began emerging long before the October Revolution, essentially just after Lenin's first writings appeared, and not in Stalin's lectures on Leninism delivered in 1924, as some bourgeois Sovietologists are prone to allege. What is more, Lenin was held in high esteem as a thinker, not only by his followers and disciples, but also by his adversaries.

The overwhelming majority of Lenin's writings before the October Revolution were published illegally. The few works he published legally evoked a wide response in academic journals and other press organs in the first two decades of this century. These documents give us an idea of how Lenin became a philosopher.

The first of Lenin's works to be legally published was his *Development of Capitalism in Russia* (1899). Strictly speaking, this was not a philosophical book, but its treatment of certain problems revealed the essence of Lenin's philosophical views, something which was reflected in the many comments on this work. Thus B. Avilov, at that time a Social-Democrat, wrote in the journal *Obrazovanie* (Education): "This book by Ilyin [V. I. Lenin—*L.S.*] is an extremely systematic and apt formulation of a definite point of view." He further noted that the "author finds his way in the most complex phenomena and is able to provide a

correct explanation for them thus confronting the reader with an integral picture of the economic process, woven from a mass of separate facts." [1] Another reviewer, P. Berlin, wrote in the newspaper *Zhizn* (Life) that "while handling a vast amount of factual material the author neither loses himself in it, nor lets himself be dominated by it, because the compass of theory always shows him which road to take." [2]

Many bourgeois and revisionist ideologists of today allege that prior to his *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism* Lenin did not deal with philosophy at all. This is easy to disprove however, from the evidence given by Lenin's friends and contemporaries. In his early book *What the "Friends of the People" Are and How They Fight the Social-Democrats*, written in 1894, Lenin makes broad use of philosophical arguments to refute the Narodniks' subjective approach and idealistic conceptions. Nadezhda Krupskaya in her reminiscences of 1893 and 1894 wrote that even at this time Lenin had the ability to step beyond a mechanical, schematic understanding of Marx's teaching, and to put questions "in a very concrete, specific way, linking them with the interests of the masses, the spirit of living Marxism, considering phenomena in their specific situation and in their development, could be felt throughout his approach". [3]

When Krupskaya came to Lenin at Shushenskoye, where he was in exile, she brought him books by Russian poets. She wrote in her reminiscences, that "Vladimir Ilyich put them by his bed, next to Hegel". [4] This shows Lenin's constant interest in philosophy. One of Lenin's comrades in the League of Struggle for the Emancipation of the Working Class, exiled not far from him in Siberia, wrote: "I remember, for instance, that at the time he studied *Science of Logic* by Hegel. And he enthusiastically told us, his comrades, of the wealth of thought contained in this treatise, without noting, it seems, that many of us (I can boldly assert this for myself anyway) were not yet ready to understand the ideas in Hegelian philosophy." [5] In these years, Lenin carried on an extensive correspondence with F. Lengnik, another of his associates in the League of Struggle for the Emancipation of the Working Class. Influenced by Kautsky's books, Lengnik at the time considered the most outstanding philosophers to be David Hu-

Pedant = a person who lays unnecessary stress on trivial points of learning, displaying a scholarship lacking in judgement or sense of proportion.

me and Immanuel Kant. "Vladimir Ilyich," he writes, "must have learned from my comrades of this infatuation of mine and started a lively correspondence with me on philosophical matters....

"His first letters knocked me to my very core. I gave up my idealist philosophers and started to study Marxist philosophy."[6] P. Lepeshinsky adds that Lenin's letters to Lengnik were sometimes real treatises on philosophy.[7]

Of especial interest is the assessment given to Lenin by one of his close friends and associates, G. Krzhizhanovsky. "V. I. Ulyanov's appearance among us in the summer of 1893," he wrote, "could be likened in its beneficient impact to the outbreak of a thunderstorm. From that moment on, a new life began for us.... Vladimir Ulyanov, who came to us from the Volga, shortly became the central figure of our organisation... As pedantic Marxists we were attracted by his wonderful ability to handle the weapon of Marx and by his excellent, veritably striking knowledge of the economic situation in the country."[8] Another old Bolshevik, S. Mickiewicz, said that from the very beginning of Lenin's political and theoretical activity Marxism acquired a tremendous new force in his person.[9]

All these facts bear out that even his earliest philosophical activity moved Lenin to the forefront of Russian Marxists. In the struggle to form the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party Lenin soon became known as a politician and theoretician not only to Russian, but also to foreign Marxists. His activity was highly regarded by August Bebel, Rosa Luxemburg and other leaders and theoreticians of European Social-Democracy. In the early 20th century Lenin was already widely recognised as an outstanding Marxist theoretician and specialist.

A major landmark in the Leninist stage of the development of Marxist philosophy was the publication in 1909 of one of his basic books on philosophy, *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism*. Right after its publication it attracted the attention of the broadest philosophical circles, both Marxist and non-Marxist. This can be seen from a number of reviews and also from extant letters and other documents.

Lenin's book was warmly welcomed by the Bolsheviks. In December 1909, Stalin wrote to the editors of the journal *Proletarii*, saying that Lenin's work was "the only one of its kind to give a full summary of the philosophy (gno-

siology) of materialism".[10] S. Shahumian noted that Lenin's work was significant because it provided "a better acquaintance with the philosophical foundations of Marxism, and, it seems, a purification of the new 'isms' purporting to add to it".[11] "We are firmly convinced of the correctness of Lenin's position,"[12] he stressed, V. V. Vorovsky published an extensive review of Lenin's book in the newspaper *Odesskoe obozrenie* (Odessa Review). He defined Lenin as a "prominent theoretician of Russian Marxism", and noted that Lenin's criticism of Machism was especially relevant for Russia, "where a whole range of Bogdanovs, Bazarovs, Yushkeviches, Bermans and Co." preach "something extremely muddle-headed, confused and reactionary".[13]

The Mensheviks too did not pass off the appearance of Lenin's work in silence L. Axelrod (Orthodox) published a review of the book in the journal *Sovremenny mir* (Contemporary World). Following the Menshevik tradition of eulogising the philosophical merits of Plekhanov she tried to prove that Lenin repeated arguments put forward by Plekhanov in his criticism of Russian Machism. This however was a lame attempt, for Plekhanov (and she herself had to admit this) made serious mistakes in assessing Machism on the question of symbols, the conception of experience, etc. Axelrod's "defence" of Plekhanov and his mistakes was a glaring departure from the scientific foundations of Marxism and this nullified the theoretical value of her article. Yet even this patently biased review noted that the "author ardently and passionately defends the truth", and that "in this book one can feel a live, fresh and brisk revolutionary spirit".[14] Axelrod's words were by and large repeated by another Menshevik, A. Avraamov, in the journal *Vozrozhdenie* (Renaissance). He called Lenin "an ardent supporter of dialectical materialism" and maintained that the book was a "very useful guide for all students of Marxist philosophy".[15]

Bourgeois philosophers commented on Lenin's book in two reviews, those by M. Bulgakov and I. Ilyin. In the late 19th century the former adhered to "legal Marxists" and by the end of the first decade of the 20th century he had become an overt supporter of bourgeois and counter-revolutionary ideas and an ideologist in the ill-fated "Vekhovstvo"[16] school. Yet even this ideological opponent of Lenin

was forced to give Lenin's work its due. In his review he noted that the author was a "most resolute supporter of the philosophy of Marx and Engels" and that his book was marked by "good language, and clear and consistent exposition".[17] Ilyin, who was a representative of "official" philosophy and adhered to Hegelianism wrote that the author was a "well-known Russian Marxist and Party leader", and that materialism was for him "the last and highest achievement in philosophy".

The foreign press also responded to Lenin's book. *Die Neue Zeit,* the German Social-Democratic journal, noted its publication.[18]

On the whole, Lenin's philosophical work played a prominent role in establishing the Leninist stage in the development of Marxist philosophy. In subsequent years his prestige as a philosopher rose still higher after the legal publication of his article "Karl Marx" and of several other articles in the newspaper *Pravda* and other Bolshevik publications. The Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party gave wide currency to the works that were published illegally.

We have every reason to say that the international working-class movement had formed the concept of Leninism, even before the October Revolution of 1917, as an integral trend in the development of Marxist theory and revolutionary practice, which rallied around itself the most consistent and convinced Marxist revolutionaries and theoreticians.

The essence of Leninism was subjected to deep and all-round scrutiny after the October Revolution. The first years of Soviet power saw the publication of works showing the significance of Lenin's theoretical ideas by many of his disciples, comrades-in-arms and followers.[19] The Ninth Party Congress decided to publish Lenin's *Collected Works.* Between 1917 and 1923 the concept of Leninism was widely used in the press, and in the reports and speeches by prominent Party leaders. Yet the basic Party documents did not employ it. This is because Lenin was very modest in assessing his own activity and demanded the same of others. In 1920, when the Moscow Party organisation decided at one of its sittings to mark the fiftieth anniversary of Lenin's birth, he left the conference hall and demanded that festivities be brought to an immediate halt. In sever-

al documents, the original versions of which used the word "Leninism", Lenin replaced it with the words "militant materialism". [20]

After Lenin's death one of the primary tasks of the Party's ideological work was formulated in the decisions taken at the following 13th Congress of the Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks) as that of "permeating all social disciplines with Leninism and using them to study the contributions made by Vladimir Ilyich Lenin to all questions of Marxist revolutionary theory and practice". [21] The 13th Congress resolved to set up a Lenin Institute which was to become "the base for studying and disseminating Leninism among the broad party and non-party masses". [22]

From 1924 onwards, prominent leaders of the RCP(B) and the Third Communist International began to show the great significance of Lenin's theoretical heritage in their works and speeches. [23] Many works on Lenin and Leninism were published at that time.

Many works were also written by young professional Marxist philosophers trained in the years of Soviet power.

The in-depth study of Lenin's philosophical heritage attracted lively discussion of its content and trends. These discussions served to substantiate a scientific understanding of the Leninist stage in Marxist philosophy. This was consolidated in the early 1930s in several Party documents and was widespread in popular writings and manuals on Marxist philosophy.

Most importantly, these discussions resulted in the definition of the Leninist stage of Marxist philosophy as the general direction taken by the development of dialectical and historical materialism in the 20th century. They emphasised that Lenin had made a tremendous contribution to the development of all the component parts of Marxism. As applied to philosophy this was expressed in Lenin's development of the Marxist teachings on matter and the forms of its existence, on dialectics as the theory of the development of the objective world, man's cognition and revolutionary transformation of it, on the dialectics of social development and the spiritual life of society, and finally on the history of philosophy and social thought as the emergence and development of two contrasting world outlooks — materialism and idealism, dialectics and metaphys-

ics, and their historical confrontation in the course of the social and scientific progress of mankind.

The discussions on Leninism resulted in several general works by Marxist philosophers, published between the 1930s and 1970s and dealing with the Leninist stage of Marxist philosophy.[24] Nowadays, analysing the philosophical problems of Leninism is the main direction taken by all fundamental research done in Soviet and foreign Marxist philosophy.

Between 1925 and 1932, the second and third editions of Lenin's *Collected Works* were published, and in the late 1940s and early 1950s the fourth edition was put out. Finally, between 1958 and 1965, a fifth, complete edition of Lenin's works saw the light of day. Concurrently, 37 volumes of *Lenin Miscellany* were published, which contain many archive materials and documents characterising Lenin's theoretical activity at different periods. The Leninist stage was scientifically divided into periods and an extensive library of works on Lenin, dealing with the fundamental problems of Marxist philosophy, was set up.

Most importantly, this research reveals a close connection between Lenin's ideas and the tasks of revolutionary practice today, and the overall progress of modern scientific thought. Modern studies of Lenin's philosophical heritage show that many of the problems of today, which do not seem to have had an analogue in Lenin's lifetime, can only be solved most effectively by creatively applying the philosophical and methodological principles Lenin advanced and substantiated.

Lenin's philosophical heritage is relevant today as ever because each new step in the development of Marxist philosophy is closely linked to a demonstration of the great significance of his philosophical ideas. Of course, since the importance of these is growing and since they are striking a firmer root in the consciousness of more and more people, it is not possible today to take a single step forward in analysing or giving concrete expression to Lenin's ideas without a sharp ideological struggle against the opponents of Leninism who are making every effort to denigrate, distort and falsify Lenin's great heritage.

However, despite all the attempts made by the opponents of Leninism to contrast to it such other alternative ideas as Kautskyism, Trotskyism,[25] those of A. Bogdanov,

G. Lukacs, E. Bloch and others, Leninism is today the only scientific form of dialectical and historical materialism and of Marxist philosophy as a whole, developing and enriching its content on the basis of new historical experience and the progress made in 20th-century science and technology. The new ideas introduced by Lenin to Marxist philosophy are, as his disciples and followers demonstrated, the only true way to further enrich and develop the scientific communist outlook during preparations for the world's first victorious socialist revolution and the new historical epoch it triggered off of mankind's transition from capitalism to socialism, the way that most fully conforms to the revolutionary spirit of Marxism.

2. The Most Important Features of the Leninist Stage in Marxist Philosophy

The development of Marxist theory, notably of Marxist philosophy at the Leninist stage, is marked by several features that reveal the essence of Leninism and radically distinguish it from all the other attempts made in the 20th century to interpret Marxism. It is common knowledge that many of the leaders of the working-class movement and of the various petty-bourgeois and bourgeois ideological and political trends have claimed an "original" interpretation of Marxism. At the turn of the century, an attempt at this was made in Russia by the "legal Marxists", Struve, and Tugan-Baranovsky among others. Roughly at this time, Marx's ideas were "amended" in Germany by E. Bernstein, to be followed later on by A. Bogdanov, F. Adler, K. Springer (Renner), K. Kautsky and others. Today, the so-called "Marxologists" from among the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois theoreticians, as well as the revisionists, claim to present a unique interpretation of Marxism. However, all these attempts have failed, one after the other, and not because their authors are weak in theory, but because they seek to replace and distort Marx's and Engels' genuine ideas by a variety of bourgeois or petty-bourgeois theories. [26]

Since it came into existence, Leninism has proceeded from fundamentally different premises. The essence of these lay in a consistent loyalty to Marxist ideas, in uphold-

ing its revolutionary content, in anti-dogmatism, i.e. taking a creative attitude to Marx's great heritage, and in a militant defence of the interests of the working people, primarily the proletariat. The most important features of Leninism are its humanism and profoundly internationalist essence. Leninism openly asserts its partisanship, i.e. consistent defence of the interests of the working class. Its partisanship is at the same time an expression of the genuinely scientific approach it takes, an in-depth analysis of the objective laws of the world development and cognition, and man's interpretation of them.

These features of Leninism, which express its essence and social significance, have made it the most powerful and widespread trend in 20th-century social knowledge. Let us consider these features in more detail.

One of the most important features, showing the principle of Lenin's approach to cognising and transforming the world by revolutionary means and on a scientific basis is, as we have noted above, consistent and all-round loyalty to the basic ideas of Marxism. As we shall see from our subsequent analysis, all the ideas contained in Lenin's works are a continuation and concrete expression of the corresponding ideas of Marx and Engels.

Following the great founders of Marxism, Lenin provided an extensive definition of Marxist philosophy as a science of most general laws governing the world and its cognition and transformation by man. At the same time, he enriched Marx and Engels' ideas by stressing the revolutionary, transformatory role of Marxist philosophy.

Elaborating on the Marxist teaching of matter and the forms of its existence, Lenin formulated a classical definition of matter, thus developing Marx's views on this question. What is more, he drew general conclusions from the scientific discoveries made at the turn of the century on the history of the class struggle of the proletariat and the whole economic and social experience of mankind, and analysed them profoundly from Marxist positions.

The same is true of Lenin's analysis of the Marxist theory of knowledge. Lenin's theory of reflection is a direct continuation of Marx and Engels' ideas on how human consciousness came into being during the qualitative leap from the biological form of the motion of matter to the social one. Lenin's teaching on the logic of theoretical thought

supplements and makes concrete Marx and Engels' philosophical approach to this problem. His principles of the dialectic of the process of cognition and its main stages are a particularly brilliant development of the ideas contained in Marx and Engels' work.

Marx wrote that he wanted to expound his views of dialectics in a special treatise. Lenin wrote the *Philosophical Notebooks*, a preparatory work for a general book on dialectics that he was destined not to write. Several parts of this work, among others the fragment "On the Question of Dialectics", "Conspectus of Hegel's Book *The Science of Logic*", "A Plan of Hegel's Dialectics (Logic)", are all direct attempts at carrying through Marx's unrealised intentions.

Lenin made a great contribution to further analysing the main questions involved in the materialist conception of history. He provided the classical exposition of Marx's teachings on the social form of the motion of matter, on the socio-economic formation, on the dialectics of the productive forces and production relations, on the basis and superstructure, on the relative independence of ideology, and on other problems. At the same time, he enriched Marxism with his theory of socialist revolution, his teaching on the new forms of class struggle in the epoch of imperialism and proletarian revolutions, and disclosed the uniformities of social progress in the new historical epoch, having created an integral teaching on society's transition from capitalism to socialism.

Lenin is credited with having elaborated on and developed a number of major trends in Marxist philosophy, such as the analysis of the laws governing the development of philosophical knowledge in the struggle of materialism and idealism, of dialectics and metaphysics, the examination of major aspects of Marxist ethics and aesthetics, scientific atheism, etc. He made a great contribution in developing the methodology of sociological research. Of particular significance is the standpoint he took on the place and role of Marxist sociological studies, the objective method in sociology, the dialectic of the subject and object of historical development, the place and role of scientific foreknowledge in Marxism, the specific application of quantitative methods of social analysis, and much else.

All this goes to show that Leninism is the 20th-centu-

ry philosophical school that most fully and all-embracingly develops the ideas of the founders of dialectical and historical materialism, Marx and Engels.

Another essential feature of Leninism is its consistent revolutionary spirit. Marx and Engels' ideas were met with anger and terror by the advocates of 19th-century capitalism precisely because they showed a logical need to develop society by revolutionary means. Today's bourgeois and revisionist Marxologists go out of their way to contrast 19th-century Marxism, as an allegedly abstractly humanistic theory, to Leninism which is "vulgar" from their standpoint precisely because it is a revolutionary theory irreconcilable with the exploitation and oppression of the working people. Yet any unbiased researcher making a conscientious study of the major works of Marx and Lenin would have to admit that what unites them in principle is their consistent adherence to revolutionary theory in analysing the social development both of 19th-century pre-monopoly capitalism by Marx and of early 20th-century imperialism by Lenin. The bourgeois fiction that Marx's work of the 1840s is abstractly humanist is confounded on closer acquaintance with several of his early works, such as *Contribution to the Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Law, The Holy Family* and *The German Ideology,* all of which were written in the first half of the 1840s. Later on he formulated the essence of his theory of the socialist revolution in *The Civil War in France, The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte* and *Manifesto of the Communist Party.* Thus Lenin genuinely continued and directly followed Marx's ideas in his substantiation of the law-governed revolutionary development of society. Lenin's analysis and creative development of the revolutionary principles of Marxism is thus both an essential feature of Leninism and an expression of the latter's unity with the theory Marx developed in the preceding period.

The intrinsic revolutionary spirit of Leninism is closely related to one of its specific features, i.e. its anti-dogmatism, the genuinely creative approach it takes to analysing and evaluating the phenomena under study. It is a fact that dogmatism did irreparable damage to the international working-class movement during the activity of the Second International. It induced a number of major workers' parties, such as those in Britain, France and Germany,

to renounce illegal revolutionary struggle. It is because of this dogmatic attitude towards theory that the opportunism preached by the Second International later degenerated into the direct denunciation of Marxism by such of its leaders as Bernstein, Kautsky and Vandervelde and their followers. During the 1905 revolution in Russia they maintained that since this was a bourgeois revolution the proletariat should passively submit to the bourgeois leadership. With the victory of the proletarian revolution in Germany in 1918, Kautsky together with Scheidemann and Noske, helped preserve and restore the old bourgeois state machinery which was quick to drown the revolutionary gains in the blood of the finest members of the German working class.

From the very beginning of his political and theoretical activity Lenin resolutely opposed the dogmatism that tore theory away from revolutionary practice. He taught that the essence of Marxism lies in a concrete analysis of a specific situation. And that loyalty to theory consists in creatively applying Marx's revolutionary method to solving the problems confronting the party and the working class, rather than in mechanically repeating the abstract postulates of the theory. Proceeding from these principles, he enriched the Marxist theory of socialist revolution in 20th-century conditions, gave concrete expression to Marx and Engels' tenets concerning the revolutionary situation and the ways along which the bourgeois-democratic revolution develops into a socialist one, and elaborated on many other fundamental problems in the dialectics of social development. In his theoretical activity he strove to fully present the internal regularities of the phenomena he analysed, and to bring out the essence of the new and its ultimate triumph over the old and obsolescent.

Furthermore, an essential feature of Leninism is its militant partisanship, an open and uncompromising defence of the interests of the working people in their struggle for social progress and the revolutionary transformation of society. Lenin stressed that the essence of Marxist partisanship lies in evaluating particular facts or ideas with an eye to the positions of the class or social group on whose behalf the particular leader is acting. Lenin showed that social knowledge would remain class and partisan in nature, as long as class society exists. The attempts by bour-

geois ideologists and revisionists to disguise their actual party anti-popular stand with arguments about the "non-partisanship of science" are only aimed at concealing their class position. Refusing to use such demagogic tricks, Lenin said, Marxism overtly and proudly declares its partisanship, since its class nature is an expression of the interests and demands of the overwhelming majority of the earth's population—the working people and non-propertied classes, i.e. the proletariat, the peasantry, the working masses in the colonies, and so on.

Lenin connected this open recognition of the class, partisan character of Marxist theory with yet another most important circumstance. Over the centuries the class, partisan character of philosophy, as well as of social knowledge in general, was seen in contrasting its ideological and epistemological (i.e. cognitive) functions. In the early 19th century, Destutt de Tracy defined social knowledge, ideology, as the "false consciousness" imparted by a particular group to the masses according to its own egoistic interests. Philosophy as a valuational attitude to the world was thus contrasted to the special sciences which cognise the world in search of truth, irrespective of particular social requirements and interests. This assessment of philosophy and social knowledge as a whole has been preserved in modern bourgeois philosophy as well. Lenin, describing the nature of the partisanship of Marxist philosophy and social knowledge as a whole, noted that the Communist Party defends the interests of the proletariat and all the working people by seeking the most reliable and shortest paths to the revolutionary remaking of society on communist principles. And such paths can only be found given an awareness and profound cognition of the objective laws governing the development of the world, i.e. nature, society and thought. This is necessary if we are to make the fullest and most skilful use of the objective laws of the world in the interests of the working majority. This being so, the Marxist principle of partisanship is bound to include a demand for a deep-going and all-round scientific approach to the cognition, interpretation and evaluation of the developments under analysis. Marxism-Leninism closely connects its ideological commitment and partisanship to a scientific approach to and an in-depth analysis of the essence of the objective laws governing the surrounding world

and man himself. Marxism-Leninism gives vivid expression to the unity of partisanship and a scientific proletarian outlook on the world, as it embodies the position and requirements of a class that is vitally interested in cognising the world and man, and in using the knowledge thus acquired to build a new, genuinely humane social system—communism.

Here we have touched on another, most important, feature of Leninism—its humanism and concern for the genuine rights of man. And not of man "in general", of some abstract entity, but of man as a member of the working majority, of a worker who creates all the riches of society with his own hands, thus assuring its existence and development. Our enemies have often alleged that Leninism is "inhumane", as it sacrifices the interests of the individual for those of the whole, i.e. for overall social development. Such assertions are nothing but demagogic attempts to distort and falsify the essence of Lenin's ideas. Lenin's entire theoretical activity was aimed at cognising the laws, methods and prospects of establishing the social relations that maximally meet the requirements and needs of the working people, i.e. the overwhelming majority of mankind. And it is no accident of course that Leninism has become the most prestigious social doctrine in the 20th century, easily finding its way to the hearts and minds of millions of working people throughout the world. Lenin's ideas have rallied and united the revolutionary forces in dozens of countries which have thrown off the yoke of imperialism and colonialism. Progressive scientists and cultural and art workers, such as Paul Langevin, Frédéric Joliot-Curie, John Bernal, Bruno Pontecorvo, Paul Robeson, Ernst Busch, and Bertolt Brecht, have consciously adopted the position of scientific communism, defending and applying Lenin's philosophical ideas in their activity.

A most important feature of Leninism is also its general human, international character. Once it had arisen in the late 19th century in Russia, a country where at the time capitalist contradictions were particularly acute and where the working class suffered from the triple exploitation of the Russian bourgeoisie, foreign capital and "its own", national bourgeoisie in the national border regions, Leninism rapidly developed beyond the boundaries of one country and became a powerful international doctrine

which rallied around itself all consistent Marxist revolutionaries. Even in the first decade of the 20th century Lenin's disciples and followers were working in Germany, Poland, Italy, Holland and other European countries, as well as in Russia.

During World War I Lenin's ideas spread even further. The First and Second Zimmerwald conferences, sponsored and chaired by Lenin, rallied the revolutionary core of practically all the genuinely socialist forces in Europe to the struggle to transform the imperialist war into a war of the working class against capitalism. The victory of the October Revolution in Russia triggered off a rapid growth in the forces adhering to Leninism. The Second International, which disintegrated at the beginning of World War I, gave place to the Third Communist International which united the Leninist-type communist parties, first of all in the more developed countries of Europe and America and then on other continents as well. The dialectic of the world communist movement can be seen here in that the revolutionaries of many countries in Asia and Latin America first familiarised themselves with Marxist teachings through works written by Lenin *The State and Revolution* and *Imperialism as the Highest Stage of Capitalism*, which were widely popular throughout the world. They played an important role in the formation of communist parties in Vietnam, Japan, China, Brazil, Mexico, Argentina and other countries.

The ideological opponents of Leninism are still trying to prove that Lenin's ideas have only a narrowly national, "purely Russian" significance. But the social development and world revolutionary process of the 20th century have entirely disproved such false assertions. The triumph of the October Revolution in Russia, the first socialist revolution in the world, the collapse of the world system of colonialism, the formation of the world socialist community and the ever sharpening general crisis of capitalism — all these facts brilliantly confirm the historical truth and great international significance of Leninism in the 20th century. Even those people who hold views far detached from Marxism and the revolutionary struggle are coming to see more clearly that Leninism is the most prestigious and powerful ideology of today. It is under Leninism that the most significant social processes of the 20th century have

taken place. Lenin's ideas have now acquired a greater importance and ideological attraction for all those in favour of peace and progress, for all working men who are in deed, and not in word, concerned with liberating mankind from oppression, human exploitation and social injustice. All this goes to show the genuinely international, humane essence of Leninism, the only true, general direction taken by the development of Marxist theory in our day and age.

To show the relevance of the Leninist stage in the development of Marxist philosophy today one must analyse and evaluate the general state of and prospects for Marxist thought in the contemporary epoch. This brings out another very important feature of Leninism, its comprehensiveness. As we know Lenin developed the whole content of Marxist theory—its economic doctrine, philosophy and scientific communism—and raised it to a new stage. Confining ourselves to the Leninist stage in the development of Marxist philosophy alone (this is the subject of this book), one finds that here, too, Lenin's contribution can hardly be overestimated for he enriched virtually all fields and aspects of philosophical knowledge with new and fundamentally important ideas and positions. Lenin raised to a new level the Marxist teaching on matter and the forms of its existence, providing a philosophical generalisation of the breakthroughs made in natural science at the turn of the century. His work resulted in a profound analysis of the theory of materialist dialectics as a general doctrine of development, the theory of knowledge and logic of Marxism, and finally the theory of the practical, transforming activity of the people. Lenin introduced a number of major principles into the materialist conception of history, supplementing it with his new theory of socialist revolution, his analysis of the laws governing the development of capitalism at the imperialist stage and transition from capitalism to socialism, and his teaching on the new, communist socio-economic formation, its productive forces, production relations, culture and intellectual life. Lenin advanced valuable ideas on the world revolutionary process in the 20th century. His ideas on communist ethics, esthetics and other fields of philosophy form the system of the present-day philosophical theory of Marxism-Leninism.

Lenin's ideas stand out for their great degree of relevance today. All periods of human history were marked by

the positing and elaborating of new ideas which reflected newly emergent phenomena and processes of social being. Most of them are however of purely historical significance today. This is not the historical fate of Lenin's ideological heritage. Referring to Marx, Lenin said that Marx's overall approach was above all marked by the elaboration of those "invaluable methods" which help reveal the essence of the processes of the development of the world.[27] This is fully applicable to Lenin's ideas as well. He tackled problems involved in revolutionary practice and theory, creating in the process general methodological principles which today form an integral, genuinely scientific methodology for solving newly emergent tasks of cognition and practice. Thus, the dialectico-materialist ideas formulated in many of Lenin's works have become the methodological basis for the development of natural science today. They underlie our understanding of the meaning and essence of the "systems approach", information theory, value analysis, the theory of solving social problems, scientific forecasting, and much else. All these problems have become especially relevant in recent decades. And study of Lenin's ideological heritage has shown that the philosophical and methodological principles he gives for scientific cognition can and must be used in analysing and evaluating these problems, which seem completely new and without analogues in the past. Thus, Lenin's view of the objects and phenomena of the material world as a unity of opposites has played a decisive role in the Marxist analysis of the systemic structure of surrounding reality. Lenin's theory of reflection has become the philosophical basis for solving information problems of social interaction. His views on the unity of the cognition, interpretation and evaluation of the world through human thought serve as a theoretical basis for tackling the problems of value analysis. Lenin's ideas on anticipating the future underlie the modern notions of the social forecasting, programming and planning of human activity. All this prompts the conclusion that the significance of Lenin's philosophical ideas has been steadily growing in the theory and practice of today.

Elaborating the philosophical problems of Leninism thus remains the main direction taken by the development of Marxist thought today. Contrary to the assertions of the many ideological opponents of the scientific, Marxist out-

look, the Leninist stage has by no means ceased with Lenin's death. It arose as a logical stage in the development of Marxist thought in the period of imperialism and proletarian revolutions, an epoch hallmarked by the victory of socialism first in (one country) and then in a number of countries, now forming a world system of socialism, an epoch of the transition of the whole of society from capitalism to socialism. Throughout this epoch Leninism has been developing and has thus been the general direction taken by the development of Marxist theory. It will determine this development up to the complete triumph of communism all over the world.

---

[1] V. I. Lenin, *Works,* Third Russ. ed., Vol. III, p. 547.
[2] *Ibid.,* p. 554.
[3] *Ibid.,* Vol. XIII, p. 335.
[4] N. K. Krupskaya, *About Lenin,* Articles and Speeches, Moscow, 1971, p. 75 (in Russian).
[5] *Reminiscences of Lenin,* Vol. 2, Moscow, 1969, p. 69 (in Russian).
[6] *Ibid.,* pp. 66, 67.
[7] See P. N. Lepeshinsky, *The Turning Point,* Moscow, 1955, pp. 114-15 (in Russian).
[8] *Reminiscences of Lenin,* Vol. 2, p. 15.
[9] *Ibid.,* p. 62.
[10] Quoted from *Vladimir Ilyich Lenin. A Biography,* Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1965, p. 167.
[11] S. G. Shahumian, *Selected Works,* Vol. I, p. 268 (in Russian).
[12] *Ibid.,* p. 286.
[13] *Odesskoye obozrenie,* No. 439, 1908, p. 3.
[14] See V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works,* Third Russ. ed., Vol. XIII, p. 333.
[15] *Ibid.,* p. 325.
[16] *"Vekhovstvo"* (Change of Landmarks)—one of the ideological trends taken by the Russian bourgeois intelligentsia after the defeat of the 1905 revolution. It derived its name from the collection *Vekhi* (Landmarks) published in 1909 by N. Berdyaev, P. Struve, I. Izgoev, among others. It called for a union between the intellectuals and the autocracy and was criticised by Lenin in his article "Concerning *Vekhi*" (1909) as an expression of "liberal renegacy", the liberal bourgeoisie's transition to a counter-revolutionary position.
[17] V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works,* Third Russ. ed., Vol. XIII, p. 326.
[18] See *Die Neue Zeit,* Band I, No. 2, 1909, S. 64.
[19] See E. Yaroslavsky, *Vladimir Ilyich Ulyanov-Lenin the Great Leader of the Workers' Revolution,* Moscow, 1918; A. Lunacharsky, *The Great Turning Point,* Petrograd, 1919; B. Gorev, *From Thomas More to Lenin,* Moscow, 1922; V. Nevsky, *V. I. Ulyanov (N. Lenin),* Moscow, 1920 etc. (all in Russian).

[20] For instance, in a letter from the Russian Communist Party's Central Committee "On Proletarian Culture Organisations" of December 1920.

[21] *The CPSU in the Resolutions and Decisions...*, Vol. 3, Moscow, 1970, pp. 104-105 (in Russian).

[22] *Ibid.*

[23] Special mention among them should be made of Stalin's *The Foundations of Leninism* and *Concerning Questions of Leninism*, which played an important role in propagandising and popularising Lenin's philosophical ideas. Much was also done on these lines by Felix Dzerzhinsky, Mikhail Kalinin, Sergei Kirov, Valerian Kuibyshev, Georgi Ordzhonikidze, among others. Among the purely philosophical works published on Leninism at this time were V. Adoratsky's "On Lenin's Study of Philosophy", *Bolshevik*, No. 2, 1930; V. Bystryansky's *Lenin as a Materialist Dialectician*, Leningrad, 1925; A. Varyash's *The Dialectics in Lenin's Eyes*, Moscow-Leningrad, 1928; A. Deborin's *Lenin as a Thinker*, Moscow, 1924; and I. Luppol's *Lenin and Philosophy*, Leningrad, 1924. Among the many foreign works published on the philosophical problems of Leninism were those by Sen-Katayama (Japan) and Marcel Cachin (France).

[24] *Trotskyism* originated in 1904 as a petty-bourgeois leftist current in Russian Social-Democracy. Subsequently, after the expulsion of its leader, Léon Trotsky, from the USSR in 1929, it gained currency in certain other countries (Britain, France, Argentina, Italy, China, etc.). Trotskyism is essentially an eclectic mixture of anarchism, sectarianism, and dogmatism, marked by an utter lack of political principles. At present, there exist several neo-Trotskyite groups, which are extremely small and often form blocs with the Maoists and extreme right-wing terrorist groups. The political influence exerted by contemporary neo-Trotskyism on international affairs is negligible.

[25] The 1930s saw the publication of several books on Lenin's philosophical activity, written by F. Gorokhov, A. Shcheglov, T. Pavlov, L. Szanto, H. Duncker, Tosaka Jun, and others. Prominent among the many works published in recent decades and dealing with the Leninist stage of Marxist philosophy are: *Leninism and the Philosophical Problems of Today* (1970), *Lenin's Stage in the Development of Marxist Philosophy* (1972), *Lenin as a Philosopher* (1969) and *Lenin's Theoretical Heritage and Modern Philosophy* (1974) (all in Russian).

[26] For further detail see Chapter IV.

[27] V. I. Lenin, "What the 'Friends of the People' Are and How They Fight the Social-Democrats", *Collected Works*, Vol. 1, p. 194.

CHAPTER II

The Development of Marxist Philosophy by Lenin Before the October Revolution

1. The Struggle for a Party of a New Type

Lenin joined the Russian Social-Democratic movement in the early 1890s. This was when Marxism won a final victory in the working-class movement of West European countries over such petty-bourgeois trends and theories as anarchism, Lassaleanism, Blanquism, etc. The Second International was set up by Marx and Engels' disciples in 1899, to directly continue the cause of the First International founded by Marx. The Social-Democratic parties of Germany, France, Italy, Austria and other European countries based their activities on Marxist tenets. International Social-Democracy was becoming one of the most powerful forces of social development.

Capitalist relations were rapidly developing in Russia at the time and the proletarian class was taking shape as a result. There arose an urgent need to unify the small and scattered workers' unions and Marxist groups into a single and consolidated movement, the need for the formation of a Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party.

Meanwhile the Russian liberation movement lacked ideological unity. The Narodnik groups continued to play a prominent role. Marxist circles and groups were dissociated from one another. Certain bourgeois nationalistic and chauvinistic trends became more active in trying to influence the working class and working peasantry. Under these conditions official tsarist ideologists, relying on the bureaucratic state apparatus and the church, were out to stem the

people's spontaneous urge for revolutionary struggle and to keep Russia's workers and peasants passive and ignorant.

At this time, so difficult for Russia, Vladimir Ilyich Ulyanov, the brother of Alexander Ulyanov, one of the last revolutionary Narodniks, who was executed by the tsar for taking part in the organisation of an attempt on the life of tsar Alexander III, left the city of Samara for St. Petersburg where he joined a local Marxist circle. Among its members were S. Radchenko, G. Krzhizhanovsky, V. Starkov, G. Krasin, A. Vaneyev and M. Silvin.

The group set itself the task of disseminating Marxism among a comparatively small circle of more educated workers, but this propaganda was not linked with the current political tasks of the working-class movement in Russia. The members did not even attempt to link up Marxist theory with practical revolutionary struggle.

Meanwhile the spontaneous activity of the working class grew steadily. Demonstrations and strikes at factories became more frequent. Yet this activity was disunited and logically doomed to failure. The tsarist authorities carried out cruel reprisals against the revolutionaries.

The need became more acute for a theoretical elaboration of the problems of the working-class movement and for a definition of the proletariat's strategy and tactics under the new historical conditions.

The theoretical problems of Marxism were the subject of an especially sharp debate in the working-class movement because of the course taken by the liberal Narodniks who at this time claimed ideological supremacy in Russian democratic thought. They maintained that the capitalist way was inconceivable for Russia, and launched an all-out campaign against Marxism, distorting its genuine content and setting it against their own idealist and subjectivist theories. It was all the more necessary to struggle against these ideas because, unlike their predecessors, the revolutionaries of the 1860s and 1870s, the Narodniks of the 1890s were increasingly sliding to the standpoint of moderate liberalism and submission to tsarist autocracy. It was necessary not only to disclose the scientific untenability and idealist character of Narodnik theories, but also to show their political untenability and their departure from the revolutionary traditions of the past.

This task was brilliantly carried out by Lenin. In 1894 he wrote his first major work, *What "The Friends of the People" Are and How They Fight the Social-Democrats* (A Reply to articles in *Russkoye Bogatstvo* opposing the Marxists). Lenin showed the utter untenability of their theory of "heroes" and "the mob", which drew a distinction between "critically-minded" personalities and the working masses. According to them, history was made by "heroes", who were blindly followed by the masses.

Contrasting such theories with the scientific, Marxist world outlook, Lenin showed that human society develops according to objective laws that do not depend on one's will or wish. He stressed moreover that the genuine motive force of social development is the people, the working masses who create all the material and spiritual wealth of society with their own hands.

Criticising Narodnik ideology, Lenin advanced a number of important propositions enriching the theory of dialectical and historical materialism. He stressed the root differences between liberal Narodism and revolutionary Marxism. While the Narodniks were accusing Russian Marxists of "renouncing" the ideological heritage of past revolutionaries, with Nikolai Chernyshevsky and his disciples primarily in mind, Lenin showed in his work "The Heritage We Renounce" (1897) that Russian Social-Democracy was in fact the only consistent force to succeed to and continue the revolutionary traditions of the Russian revolutionary democrats. A revolutionary character, he said, is an endemic feature of Marxism, while the Narodniks, renouncing illegal struggle and reducing their activity to literary battles, were in fact siding with the enemies of the revolution.

The Narodniks maintained that society could not be governed by any objective laws. Hence they concluded that an objective method was impossible in social analysis and that a science of social development could not therefore exist. While exposing these reactionary views Lenin gave an example of a dialectical analysis of social development in his *What the "Friends of the People" Are and How They Fight the Social-Democrats*, and *the Development of Capitalism in Russia* (1896-1899). To be an orthodox Marxist, he said, is least of all a matter of advocating a simple rehash of Marx's propositions. Consistent Marxists develop the basic Marxist tenets according to the changed

conditions of the historical process and the specific features of social development in particular countries, and creatively develop the theory of dialectical materialism. The main thing here is the specific analysis of facts. Such an analysis is closely connected in Marxism with the needs of the proletarian class, as the scientific explanation of social development meets its fundamental interests.

This objective analysis shows that the development of society is marked by a series of recurrent phenomena. This recurrency prompts the undeniable conclusion that society is subject to objective laws of development, just as nature is. And this in turn brings the researcher to the need to work out an objective method in sociology and philosophy as a whole. Marx showed that the factors determining social development are the productive forces and production relations, comprising in their unity the mode of production. The economic basis of society engenders the corresponding superstructure—the state, the parties and the corresponding forms of social consciousness (political, legal, moral, religious, aesthetic and philosophical). To describe each stage or period of social development (the level of the productive forces and the corresponding totality of the production relations, the economic basis of society and the corresponding superstructure), Marx uses the concept of socio-economic formation.

In his works Lenin further developed Marx's teaching on the socio-economic formation, showed the unity and integrity of the social process, the internal connection between material and ideological phenomena in the history of mankind and the determining, leading role played by the objective laws in the development of society.

Lenin also found a scientific solution to the problem of the role of the people and the individual in history. The Narodniks accused Marxism of "economic materialism", i.e. of fatalism, of denying the role and freedom of the individual. Lenin showed that genuine Marxism is the exact opposite of "economic materialism". The basic Marxist idea is that social relations are divided into the material and the ideological, the latter being a superstructure over the former. At the same time, these secondary, superstructory phenomena, can, once arisen, exert an active feedback effect on the material relations that have engendered them. It is here that the subjective factor of social development is be-

ing realised. Man acquires genuine freedom by cognising the laws of the objective world. Recognising the strict regularity of social development is not tantamount to denying the freedom of man's activity; on the contrary, it is a matter of classifying the conditions and essence of this freedom. "The idea of determinism," Lenin wrote, "which postulates that human acts are necessitated and rejects the absurd tale about free will, in no way destroys man's reason or conscience, or appraisal of his actions. Quite the contrary, only the determinist view makes a strict and correct appraisal possible instead of attributing everything you please to free will." [1]

Lenin stressed further on that the idea of historical necessity in no way undermines the role of the individual in history. "The real question that arises in appraising the social activity of an individual is: what conditions ensure the success of his actions, what guarantee is there that these actions will not remain an isolated act lost in a welter of contrary acts?" [2]

The fundamental conclusion Lenin came to in criticising Narodnik idealistic theories on the role of the individual in history is that the "answer to this question depends directly and immediately on the way in which the grouping of social forces in Russia and the class struggle which forms the substance of Russian reality are understood". [3]

The task of Marxist theory, Lenin said, was to show the real position of the class forces in Russia and to bring out the decisive role of the working class as the natural vanguard of the working masses in their struggle against tsarism and capitalism. Lenin revealed the essence of the Marxist tenet on the hegemony of the proletariat in the revolutionary struggle, and its close connection with all the other democratic sections of society—above all with the peasantry, an alliance with whom he considered to be a decisive condition in overthrowing tsarism and the power of the exploiting classes.

Lenin thus formulated the great historical mission of the proletariat: "... It is on the working class that the Social-Democrats concentrate all their attention and all their activities. When its advanced representatives have mastered the ideas of scientific socialism, the idea of the historical role of the Russian worker, when these ideas become widespread, and when stable organisations are formed among

the workers to transform the workers' present sporadic economic war into conscious class struggle—the Russian WORKER, rising at the head of all the democratic elements, will overthrow absolutism and lead the RUSSIAN PROLETARIAT (side by side with the proletariat of ALL COUNTRIES) *along the straight road of open political struggle to the victorious communist revolution.*" [4]

Lenin's first major work, *What the "Friends of the People" Are and How They Fight the Social-Democrats,* and other writings exposing the idealistic theories of Narodism, thus ushered in a new stage in the development of Marxist philosophy. This stage is linked with the philosophical conclusions drawn from the new historical experience of the late 19th century and with setting tasks to be undertaken in the revolutionary struggle of the working class, with the contradictions in the exploiter society rapidly growing and class forces being formed, headed by the proletariat and rising to the struggle for liberation.

Another major direction in Lenin's philosophical activity at the turn of the century was his development of Marxist theory exposing the fallacy of the revisionist theories which enjoyed some popularity in Russia and the West.

Soon after Engels' death the German Social-Democratic journal *Die Neue Zeit* began to publish a series of articles written by Eduard Bernstein, a prominent theoretician of the Second International. In the 1880s, Bernstein called himself a disciple of Marx and Engels. At that time, before the emergency laws against the Socialists in Germany were repealed, he was the editor of *Der Sozial-Demokrat,* an illegal organ of German Social-Democracy. Even at that time Engels noted in some of his letters that Bernstein deviated towards opportunism. After Engels' death Bernstein came out openly with a revision of Marxist philosophy. His articles in *Die Neue Zeit* were published under a single title, *Probleme des Sozialismus.* In 1899, he published them as a separate book, *Die Voraussetzungen des Sozialismus und die Aufgaben der Sozialdemokratie* (The Prerequisites of Socialism and the Tasks of Social-Democracy). Bernstein in fact launched an open attack on Marxism, and his ideas were echoed by opportunistic elements in the socialist parties of a number of European countries, including Russia. Lenin, in his first theoretical writings, adopted a clear-cut, irreconcilable stand towards Bernsteinism. The whole

point of Bernstein's theories, he said, was that "Social-Democracy must change from a party of social revolution into a democratic party of social reforms",[5] i.e. to turn in fact from a proletarian into a petty-bourgeois party. He classed Bernstein's ideas as a turn to bourgeois criticism of Marxism.

Bernstein's ideas boiled down to an attempt to substitute bourgeois eclecticism for Marxist revolutionary dialectics, to replace the materialist conception of history with neo-Kantian ideas on the unknowability and unpredictability of the historical process, to make the idea of scientific socialism an abstract notion and to counter it with an absolutised form of the workers' economic struggle to improve their life within the framework of exploiter relations.

In Russia, Bernstein's ideas were first echoed by the "legal Marxists". These were bourgeois intellectuals who, influenced by the Marxist ideas, that were widespread in the late 19th century, declared their support for Marxism, not in its entirety but only for those Marxist propositions which substantiated the necessity and law-governed character of the capitalist stage in social development. The "legal Marxists"—P. Struve, S. Bulgakov, and M. Tugan-Baranovsky among others, were so called because all their "Marxist" activity boiled down to publishing their writings in legal press. They saw their task in criticising the Narodniks, who stated that Russia could develop in a "special", non-capitalist way, and in advocating the thesis that capitalist development was indispensable for Russia. From the class angle the "legal Marxists" were the ideologists of the Russian liberal bourgeoisie. They wrote much about the progressive nature of capitalism and tried to convince workers that their interests should be fully subordinated to those of the bourgeoisie. Subsequently they began to openly oppose Marxism and after the Great October Socialist Revolution became the sworn enemies of Soviet power.

Lenin and his associates considered it possible to come to a temporary agreement with the "legal Marxists" in the struggle against Narodism. However, as early as 1894 Lenin had given a profound criticism of their position in his paper "The Reflection of Marxism in Bourgeois Literature, P. Struve. *Critical Remarks on the Subject of Russia's Economic Development*". In it, Lenin disclosed the bourgeois essence of "legal Marxism" and the fact that it

was the utter antithesis of the revolutionary content of Marxism. In 1895, Lenin published his paper in the collection *Material on the Characterisation of Our Economic Development*, entitling it *The Economic Content of Narodism and the Criticism of It in Mr. Struve's Book*. In this major work Lenin provided a thorough critical analysis of both Struve's theory and Bernstein's revision of Marxism. A full-scale struggle against Bernstein's theories ensued two years later. But even before Bernstein's open attack on Marxism, Lenin criticised Struve and his followers, disclosing the essence of revisionism as an international crusade against Marxism.

First of all Lenin revealed the bourgeois essence of Struve's objectivistic position: "The objectivist speaks of the necessity of a given historical process; the materialist gives an exact picture of the given social-economic formation and of the antagonistic relations to which it gives rise. When demonstrating the necessity for a given series of facts, the objectivist always runs the risk of becoming an apologist for these facts; the materialist discloses the class contradictions and in so doing defines his standpoint.... Thus, on the one hand, the materialist is more consistent than the objectivist, and gives profounder and fuller effect to his objectivism.... On the other hand, materialism includes partisanship, so to speak, and enjoins the direct and open adoption of the standpoint of a definite social group in any assessment of events."[6] As we can see, Lenin here expounds a major philosophical principle of Marxism, i.e. the unity of its scientific approach and ideological commitment, its open partisanship, realised in defending the interests of the proletarian class and all the other working people following it.

Lenin made the point that Marx and Engels in themselves provided examples of revolutionary partisanship and irreconcilability to any ideological vacillations. He wrote that they were "uncommonly responsive *politically*".[7] This was in particular manifested in the fact that any "tendency, for the sake of illusory economic advantages, to turn away from the most immediate and important task of the Russian socialists, namely, the winning of political freedom, naturally appeared suspicious to them and was even regarded by them as a direct betrayal of the great cause of the social revolution".[8]

It follows that the activity of the "legal Marxists", who snatched Marx's teaching on the historical necessity of capitalism out of the overall context of his theory, was, in fact, as Lenin showed, an attack on Marxism. The "legal Marxists" discarded the teaching on classes, the class struggle and the social revolution, thus distorting the very essence of dialectical and historical materialism.

Following Bernstein's writings, another petty-bourgeois trend arose in Russia, claiming to "develop" Marxist theory. This was the so-called Economism, whose representatives directly denounced the political and ideological struggle and called on the workers to fight the bourgeoisie on economic terms alone. Lenin exposed this theory in another of his large-scale works, *What Is To Be Done?* (1902).

Before analysing the philosophical content of this book we must deal in brief with certain facts arising from the history of the struggle waged by Lenin and his followers against Economism, as a Russian variety of Bernsteinism.

On the night of December 8, 1895, Lenin and his associates in the League of Struggle for the Emancipation of the Working Class were arrested and in March of the following year, 1896, they were exiled to Eastern Siberia for different periods. While in exile Lenin continued his vigorous theoretical activity. He wrote *The Development of Capitalism in Russia* and published the collection *Economic Essays and Articles* which included "A Characterisation of Economic Romanticism", "The Handicraft Census of 1894-95 in Perm Gubernia and General Problems of the 'Handicraft' Industry", "Germs of Narodnik Project-Mongering", "On the Question of Our Factory Statistics", and "The Heritage We Renounce". Concurrently, Lenin and Krupskaya translated *The History of Trade-Unionism* (in two volumes) by Sidney and Beatrice Webb for a publishing-house in St. Petersburg. He carried on a lively correspondence over theoretical and ideological issues with Marxist theorists in Russia and the Emancipation of Labour group in Geneva (Plekhanov and others). He also kept a close watch on the ideological life of Russian Social-Democracy in Petersburg, Moscow and other centres in Russia.

In July 1899, Lenin received a letter and a document, both written in invisible ink, from his sister Anna Yelizarova-Ulyanova. The document was written by Ye. Kuskova, then well-known as a bourgeois philosopher and publi-

cist. Living abroad in the mid-1890's, Kuskova studied Marx's teaching and adhered to certain followers of Bernstein in the West. Having returned to Russia she led, together with her husband S. Prokopovich, the so-called Group for the Self-Emancipation of the Working Class (autumn 1899) which issued a declaration stating its aims, charter and several appeals to the workers. A better known document, however, was the one sent to Lenin, called the *Credo*. In this document Kuskova's group, which called themselves the "young" (unlike the "old", i.e. the Leninists) averred that Marxism, in the form it had existed from the *Communist Manifesto* until the 1890s, was "intolerant" and "primitive" and had to be replaced by a general "democratic" theory of a "different Marxism, suited to, and necessary in, Russian conditions".[9] The aim of this "different Marxism, Kuskova held, lay in "assistance to the economic struggle of the proletariat" and in the participation of the Social-Democrats in the liberal-oppositional activities of the bourgeoisie. The Economists thus drew a clear distinction between their conception of Marxism and the revolutionary movement of the proletariat, and tried to turn Social-Democracy into an appendage of the liberal bourgeoisie. They preached a "theory of spontaneity", according to which the working-class movement should dispense with the leading role of revolutionary theory, and socialist-minded intellectuals should follow the spontaneous working-class movement alone, directing it merely towards economic struggle, apparently the most important for the workers. As for political struggle and ideology, in Russia these were to be determined by the bourgeoisie as the class which was going to replace the landowners and autocracy.

In August 1899, Lenin wrote "A Protest by Russian Social-Democrats" against the *Credo*. His article was discussed and approved at a meeting of 17 exiled Marxists (mostly members of the Leninist League of Struggle) in the village of Yermakovskoye in Minusinsk Uyezd. It was then secretly sent abroad and immediately published by Plekhanov. At first the economistically-minded editors of the journal *Rabocheye Dyelo* (The Workers' Cause), where Plekhanov sent Lenin's "Protests" to, published it not in the journal but as a separate leaflet with a note that the "*Credo* represented the opinion of individuals whose posi-

tion did not constitute a danger to the Russian working-class movement". [10] Then Plekhanov republished the "Protest" in the collection *Vademecum*, directed against the Economists and intended for the *Rabocheye Dyelo* editorial board.

Criticising the Economists, in the "Protest", Lenin demonstrated the similarity between their ideological stand and Bernstein's revision of Marxism. "Bernsteinism," he wrote, "is an attempt to narrow the theory of Marxism, to convert the revolutionary workers' party into a reformist party." [11] All consistent Marxists, Lenin said, must resolutely rebuff Bernstein's attempts to separate the proletariat's economic struggle from its political and theoretical struggle. Nor must there be any changes in the attitude of the Marxists to bourgeois ideology and politics. "The proletariat," Lenin pointed out, "must strive to form independent political workers' parties, the main aim of which must be the capture of political power by the proletariat for the purpose of organising socialist society." [12]

The Economists' allegations that the working class, "has not yet put forward political aims" only betrayed their ignorance of the actual state of affairs and their aloofness from the real revolutionary movement in Russia. "Russian Social-Democrats," Lenin wrote, "must declare determined war upon the whole body of ideas expressed in the *Credo*." [13] Somewhat later, in his article "A Retrograde Trend in Russian Social-Democracy", Lenin again stressed that the Marxist conception of the place and role of the working-class movement was based on two main principles: the organisation of the political party and the class struggle of the proletariat for the purpose of winning political power and freedom, and a struggle to transfer all the means of production over to the working people and to replace the capitalist economy with a socialist one. [14]

Lenin completed his ideological exposé of Bernsteinism and Russian Economism in his *What Is To Be Done?*. This was written between 1901 and early 1902, published illegally in March 1902, and given a broad distribution among the Social-Democratic organisations of Russia.

First of all, Lenin noted that the Economists and Bernsteinians held identical political views: "let the workers carry on the economic struggle . . . , and let the Marxist intelligentsia merge with the liberals for the political 'strug-

gle'." [15] This stand exposed the bourgeois essence of Bernsteinism. Furthermore, criticising the Economist assertion that the power of the working-class movement lay in its spontaneity and that this should not be hindered by introducing scientific consciousness into the working-class movement, Lenin stressed that "the 'spontaneous element', in essence, represents nothing more nor less than consciousness in an *embryonic form*". [16] The Economists' worship of spontaneity was nothing but an attempt to weaken and disorganise the working-class movement, to deprive it of theoretical guidance, doom it to a struggle for petty concessions and make the proletariat renounce its ultimate aims. As Lenin wrote, "*all* worship of the spontaneity of the working-class movement, all belittling of the role of 'the conscious element', of the role of Social-Democracy, *means, quite independently of whether he who belittles that role desires it or not, a strengthening of the influence of bourgeois ideology upon the workers*", [17] because the "*spontaneous* development of the working-class movement leads to its subordination to bourgeois ideology". [18] This tenet of Lenin's was fully and graphically confirmed by the subsequent history of the major social-democratic parties of the Second International, such as the socialist parties of France and Italy, the Social-Democratic Party of Germany and the British Labour Party. All of them, having broken with revolutionary Marxism during the collapse of the Second International in August 1914, opted for becoming bourgeois parties. Now that several of them have become the ruling parties in their countries, it is especially clear that their ideology and politics are opposed to the vital interests of the working-class movement and are aimed at defending the interests of capital.

Lenin sharply criticised the Economists' idea that the conscious revolutionary work done by the Marxists apparently causes them to "*belittle the significance of the objective or the spontaneous element of development*". [19] This is another essential feature of the spontaneity theory which tries to identify the spontaneous with the objective, and the conscious with the subjective. Lenin exposed this confusion of Marxist concepts as being impermissible, showing that "belittling" of objective development can only mean the lack of consciousness properly to understand objective development, i.e. the lack of the necessary knowledge about

the objective world which constitutes the essence of the "*conscious* element".[20] He writes: "Just as our grandfathers in their old-fashioned wisdom used to say, Anyone can bring children into the world, so today the 'modern socialists' (*à la Nartsis* Tuporylov) say in their wisdom, Anyone can participate in the spontaneous birth of a new social order."[21] To adopt such a stand, Lenin notes, means to follow the movement and be its tail, thus "it would be more correct" to describe this tendency "not as opportunism, but as *tail-ism* (from the word *tail*)".[22]

Further on, in *What Is To Be Done?*, Lenin analyses the development of the class consciousness of the proletariat. He writes that first "the workers were losing their age-long faith in the permanence of the system which oppressed them and began . . I shall not say to understand, but to sense the necessity for collective resistance, definitely abandoning their slavish submission to the authorities. But this was, nevertheless, more in the nature of outbursts of desperation and vengeance than of *struggle*".[23] No doubt the lost faith in the immutability of capitalism and the sensed necessity to resist the exploiters is both new knowledge of the world and a new appreciation of it. Just such an appreciation and knowledge were expressed in the spontaneous action of such workers as the Lyons weavers or the Silesian miners in the first half of the 19th century. Lenin called these movements "primitive revolts", "the resistance of the oppressed".[24] The spontaneous element described by Lenin as "consciousness in an *embryonic form*" is still dominant here.

The next step in the development of the class consciousness of the proletariat is its being aware of itself as a force opposed to the existing system and the ruling classes, singling itself out from the surrounding social sections and groups. Lenin writes in this context: "Instead of having a hazy hatred of the capitalist, the workers have already begun to understand the antagonism between the interests of the working class and of the capitalist class. Instead of having a confused sense of oppression, they have begun to distinguish *the ways and means* by which capital oppresses them and are revolting against various forms of oppression, placing limits to capitalist oppression, and protecting themselves against the capitalists' greed. Instead of working vengeance on the capitalists they are now turning to the

fight for concessions, ...are demanding improved working conditions, increased wages, and shorter working hours." [25] Lenin shows that the proletariat's awareness that its interests are quite different to those of the capitalist brings it to believe that the class struggle is inevitable not only against the particular capitalist, the owner of a particular enterprise, but also against the whole of the capitalist system, embodying the oppression and exploitation of man by man. The emergence of this conviction, or rather idea, gives rise to the workers' systematic action against the capitalist, not in the form of spontaneous revolts but of organised strikes aimed at improving the working people's economic conditions. But such strikes, according to Lenin, were not yet the class struggle in the entire meaning of the concept. Lenin writes: "...The systematic strikes represented the class struggle in embryo, but only in embryo. Taken by themselves, these strikes were simply trade union struggles, not yet Social-Democratic struggles. They marked the awakening antagonisms between workers and employers; but the workers were not, and could not be, conscious of the irreconcilable antagonism of their interests to the whole of the modern political and social system, i.e. theirs was not yet Social-Democratic consciousness." [26] At this stage knowledge and appreciation had not yet attained the level of a scientific theory. They still remained within the living contemplation of reality, i.e. the first stage of dialectical cognition.

Later on, consciousness of the working class made a tremendous qualitative leap, combining the advantages of the largely spontaneous working-class movement with Marxist theory and its scientifically substantiated, socialist consciousness. Lenin says that "the history of all countries shows that the working class, exclusively by its own effort, is able to develop only trade-union consciousness, i.e., the conviction that it is necessary to combine in unions, fight the employers, and strive to compel the government to pass necessary labour legislation, etc." [27] And for the consciousness of the working class to become genuinely socialist, i.e. scientific and revolutionary, the working-class movement must be combined with Marxism, with scientific socialism.

The dialectics of historical development shows that the theoretical teaching of socialism arose, as Lenin writes, "altogether independently of the spontaneous growth of the

working-class movement, it arose as a natural and inevitable outcome of the development of thought among the revolutionary socialist intelligentsia".[28] Yet the emergence of scientific socialism itself, the cognition and appreciation of the world-wide historical role of the proletariat, the great historic accomplishment of Marx and Engels were the precise solution to the task, objectively set by historical development, of identifying the motive force of social process which would be able to lead mankind towards liberation from exploitation and oppression, towards the abolition of classes and the creation of a genuinely free association of producers, i.e. communist society. To solve this task Marx and Engels mastered all earlier knowledge of social processes, devised a theory that included political economy, philosophy and the theory of scientific socialism and, in Party and political respects, went over to the standpoint of the proletariat, having become its theoretical and political leaders. This was expressed in their establishment of the Communist League and later on of the First International. In all of this scientific knowledge was organically fused with the political and ideological struggle of the Marxists to consolidate and organise the proletariat on the basis of scientific socialism.

"The theory of socialism," Lenin wrote, "grew out of the philosophical, historical and economic theories elaborated by educated representatives of the propertied classes, by intellectuals."[29] This theory armed the working class with a scientific way to cognise and evaluate the conditions of its existence and with the revolutionary methods to be used to change these conditions.

The ideas of scientific socialism, Lenin showed, penetrated the class consciousness of the proletariat in several stages. One of the first, basic conditions of this process was broad political propaganda and the organisation of all-round political denunciations of capitalism and its lackeys. Lenin said that "*in no way,* except by means of such exposures *can* the masses be trained in political consciousness and revolutionary activity". These exposures were aimed at teaching workers to "observe *every* other social class in *all* the manifestations of its intellectual, ethical and political life".[30] Lenin assessed this process as the "self-knowledge of the working class, ... indissolubly bound up, not solely with a fully clear theoretical under-

standing—or rather not so much with the theoretical, as with the practical, understanding—of the relationships between *all* the various classes of modern society". [31] Thus, the combination of Marxism with the working-class movement, Lenin stressed, must be based on a totality of ideas, already worked out in proletarian consciousness, with regard to capitalist society.

The next stage in forming the consciousness or the scientific views of the proletariat is to propagandise Marxist theory among the most active and staunch proletarians, in order to make them into revolutionaries, the political and ideological leaders of their class. Lenin pointed out that one of the major duties of such leaders was to "gain an ever closer insight into all theoretical questions, to free themselves more and more from the influence of traditional phrases inherited from the old world outlook, and constantly to keep in mind that socialism, since it has become a science, demands that it be pursued as a science i.e., that it be studied". [32] In this process of gaining social self-knowledge by the most conscious members of the working class an important role is played by the fact that scientific socialism most profoundly and correctly defines the causes of the workers' hardships and shows the prospects for eliminating them and how to do this. This is why workers assimilate the tenets of scientific socialism so easily and firmly and are more able than other classes to translate this knowledge into active struggle. Thus, also at this stage of the formation of the scientific consciousness of the working class, knowledge is organically fused with the evaluation of it and with turning it into reality.

Lenin explains this proposition in several of his works and shows that the combination of the scientific theory of Marxism with the working-class movement does not signify just the dialectical unity of theory and practice, but also the unity of the scientific and partisan approach characteristic of Marxist social science. Criticising Struve's views in one of his first works, he writes: "Materialism includes partisanship, so to speak, and enjoins the direct and open adoption of the standpoint of a definite social group in any assessment of events." [33] As we can see, Lenin here connects the concept of partisanship directly and immediately with assessment or evaluation, as a necessary component of the whole process of social cognition.

In the works he wrote in this period Lenin formulated important ideas on the place and role of valuational cognition and value orientations in the theory and practice of the revolutionary struggle of the working class. He showed that in Marxist-Leninist philosophy the concept of evaluation has several aspects. The main, determining one, that of use-value, was comprehensively analysed by Marx in his economic works. This is the ability of a given thing, phenomenon or idea to serve as the object of people's material or spiritual consumption. The second aspect is strictly economic; it is connected with the relations of distribution and exchange among people and manifests itself as the value of a particular object in these relations. The third aspect is the disclosure of the value nature of the material and ideological relations among people. It is realised in political, religious, legal, moral and other valuations and occupies an important, albeit secondary place in the struggle of philosophies in a class society. Finally, there is a special aesthetic aspect (the beautiful and the ugly, the tragic and the comic, etc.) of value approach. At first sight, this is not directly connected to the class struggle. According to bourgeois ideologists it has "general human" criteria (incidentally, they maintain the same with regard to morality, law, religion, etc.). In actual fact, however, this aspect is also closely bound up with the ideological struggle, something which Nikolai Chernyshevsky brilliantly demonstrated a century ago.

The concept of value, Lenin said, is closely linked to the active nature of man's attitude to the outside world and his evaluation of particular objects and phenomena. The determination of a particular value depends on man's position in the system of social relations. In a class society the concept of value is always class and partisan in character. For instance, for the capitalist, the installation of a new machine at his enterprise has a positive value, as it enables him to derive additional profits. But for the worker made redundant by the factory because of this machine, it has a negative value, as it deprives him of his means of livelihood.

Determining the value of a particular phenomenon or object also depends on the level of intellectual and cultural development of different population groups. For instance, up-to-date technical devices have no value to someone liv-

ing in a backward country, who does not know their purpose and is ignorant of technology. At the same time, he greatly values the simple implements he can use, the loss of which threatens him with starvation.

The valuational attitude of people to the surrounding world is directly dependent on their world outlook and knowledge of the world.

All aspects of the concept of values, Lenin noted, are united by one common feature, which is that knowledge of a particular object incorporates the latter's interaction with man, i.e. the subjective attitude of a man, group, class, and society as a whole to the object under cognition. The common feature in people's valuational attitude to the world is active cognition, comprehension and assimilation of that world. And since human society is a class society, i.e. different groups of people have different status in relation to production, property and the distribution and exchange of material and spiritual goods, the value definitions of objects and phenomena are an arena of acute class struggle in politics, ideology, law, morality, religion and science. Hence partisanship is a social phenomenon consisting in an open defence of class interests by particular human communities. Bourgeois philosophers and revisionists as a rule deny the partisanship of philosophy and social knowledge. Yet this is just a demagogic trick aimed at disguising the narrow egoistic, basically anti-popular essence of the ideology of the exploiters, an ideology inimical to real knowledge of the world and the laws of its development.

Unlike this, Lenin said, Marxist philosophy is partisan. This is expressed in its open defence of the interests and goals of the proletariat and its allies and in its being the highest form of scientific objectivity.

The proletariat, Lenin said, is the only class in history whose social aspirations largely coincide with those of all the working people, i.e. the overwhelming majority of the earth's population. More than any other class, the proletariat is interested in the speedy and complete socialist reconstruction of all of society. And more than any other class, it needs for this a profound and exhaustive knowledge of the world and its laws. This is why the partisan attitude taken by the proletariat and its party to social knowledge is a strictly scientific and genuinely objective one. The subjective aspect of the proletariat's attitude to the

surrounding reality lies in its urge to reflect this reality as profoundly, fully and adequately as possible in its consciousness, to evaluate it correctly, and to make maximum use of the knowledge thus acquired in changing the world.

The combining of the working-class movement with scientific socialism thus signifies the final form of the class consciousness of the proletariat, based on all the preceding knowledge and contemporary experience. Lenin identified four inter-related aspects in the class consciousness of the proletariat. The first is the "workers' understanding that the only way to improve their conditions and to achieve their emancipation is to conduct a struggle against the capitalist class . . .". The second "means their understanding that the interests of all the workers . . are identical, that they all constitute one class, separate from all the other classes in society".[34] The third aspect is that the workers are aware of both the possibility and the historical inevitability of winning power in society. And finally the fourth aspect is the proletariat's awareness of its vanguard role in relation to all the other, non-proletarian working masses, such as the peasantry, the peoples of colonial and oppressed countries, etc.

The further development of workers' class consciousness entails setting up their political vanguard, the Communist Party, rallying all the forces to promote socialist revolution and after its victory combining all the advantages of socialism with the latest achievements in science, technology and culture; that is to say it entails combining the world revolutionary process with the scientific and technological revolution of the 20th century and the accompanying revolutionary changes in human culture.

What Is To Be Done? is a social and political work. But it also has deep-going philosophical significance as it constitutes a major component of Lenin's work to develop philosophical problems of Marxism on the basis of the working-class movement's new experience at the turn of the century. In this context one should distinguish three major theoretical aspects characterising Lenin's creative development of the problems of dialectical and historical materialism: first, the role of scientific theory in the revolutionary practical activities of the party and the working people; secondly, Lenin's comprehensive demonstration of the dialectic of the conscious and the spontaneous in the

historical process and the working-class movement; and, thirdly his philosophical analysis of the role of the proletarian party in the world revolutionary process and the significance of this process being scientifically guided by a workers' party of a new type.

Lenin stressed that socialist consciousness introduced into the broad working masses, should be viewed as the "only basis that can guarantee our victory". [35] Without theoretical work among the masses, he wrote, the "successful growth of the movement was impossible". [36] Lenin considered that the "much vaunted freedom of criticism" proclaimed by Bernstein and advocated by the Economists was nothing but "freedom from all integral and pondered theory; it implies eclecticism and lack of principle". [37]

Lenin specially stressed the significance, for the party's theoretical work, of a knowledge of all preceding philosophy, its progressive traditions and most important directions. "Without German philosophy which preceded it, particularly that of Hegel, German scientific socialism ... would never have come into being". [38] At the same time, he showed that scientific socialism "rests on the shoulders of Saint-Simon, Fourier and Owen, three men who in spite of all their fantastic notions and all their utopianism, have their place among the most eminent thinkers of all times". [39] So far as the Russian working-class movement was concerned, Lenin said, "let the reader recall such predecessors of Russian Social-Democracy as Herzen, Belinsky, Chernyshevsky, and the brilliant galaxy of revolutionaries of the seventies". [40]

The task of revolutionary Social-Democracy, Lenin said, was to draw the attention of the advanced workers, in their struggle against the capitalists, the tsar and the landowners, to scientific theory, to use the entire wealth of knowledge accumulated by the social thought of preceding decades in solving the vital tasks of today. Only such an approach to theory can ensure general success. Only resolute exposure of all attempts to belittle the role of theory can create the conditions necessary for the tasks facing the working class and its party to be accomplished correctly. "Without revolutionary theory there can be no revolutionary movement", [41] this thesis of Lenin's has become a fundamental principle in the development of parties of a new type, parties whose activity is based on a solid foundation

of scientific knowledge and a combination of this knowledge with the broad movement of the working people. Lenin concluded his treatment of the question of the role of theory in the revolutionary movement with no less famous a proposition: ("*the role of vanguard fighter can be fulfilled only by a party that is guided by the most advanced theory*")[42] The truth of this proposition has been borne out in practice. The history of the CPSU, the history of other communist and workers' parties and the history of the entire world communist movement at all stages irrefutably show that any disparagement of theory, any departure from the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism, inevitably leads either to the defeat or to the betrayal of the working-class cause and a transition to the position taken by the class enemies of the proletariat.

The second general theoretical question considered by Lenin in *What Is To Be Done?* concerns the dialectic of the conscious and the spontaneous in the historical process. Attention should be drawn here, above all, to Lenin's definition of the very concepts of the spontaneous and the conscious. Both before and after the publication of his book the spontaneous was often defined as something occurring outside and independently of human consciousness. Lenin provided a precise and unambiguous definition of the spontaneous, writing: "the 'spontaneous element', in essence, represents nothing more nor less than consciousness in an *embryonic form*".[43] This formulation shows the worthlessness of all the vague definitions of the spontaneous which sought to separate this category from human consciousness.

What is "the conscious"? As applied to the struggle for socialism, Lenin maintained this meant to "gain an ever clearer insight into all theoretical questions, to free themselves more and more from the influence of traditional phrases inherited from the old world outlook, and constantly to keep in mind that socialism, since it has become a science, demands that it be pursued as a science, i.e., that it be studied".[44] Hence the category of the conscious expresses the knowledge of man or a social group of the essence of the laws of development of the objects they interact with, and the mastery of the entire theoretical wealth pertaining to this question and accumulated by society in a particular period. Lenin stressed that a spontaneous pro-

cess may not in itself become a conscious one. To bring this about the spontaneously emergent movement must be combined with the full knowledge attained about it by human thought. Lenin referred here to the fusion of the working-class struggle for emancipation with scientific socialism. "The history of all countries," he writes, "shows that the working class, exclusively by its own effort, is able to develop only trade-union consciousness .... The theory of socialism, however, grew out of the philosophic, historical, and economic theories elaborated by educated representatives of the propertied classes, by intellectuals." [45]

The process of fusing the working-class movement with scientific socialism is largely helped by the fact that "socialist theory reveals the causes of the misery of the working class more profoundly and more correctly than any other theory, and for that reason the workers are able to assimilate it so easily". [46] The party must, however, bring the theory in its true revolutionary substance, free from bourgeois and revisionist distortions, to the consciousness of the working class. Lenin stressed, in ideological struggle "the *only* choice is—either bourgeois or socialist ideology. There is no middle course ... to belittle the socialist ideology *in any way, to turn aside from it in the slightest degree* means to strengthen bourgeois ideology". [47]

And, finally, in *What Is To Be Done?* Lenin considered the philosophical question of the place and role of the proletarian party in the revolutionary process, its scientific leadership of the workers and all the working people in their struggle to reconstruct society along socialist lines.

The first major principle advanced by Lenin as the basis for creating a party of a new type is that of revolutionary action. The party, he said, is formed to conduct revolutionary activity. "In view of this common characteristic of the members of such an organisation, (*all distinctions as between workers and intellectuals ... must be effaced.*)" [48] The first task in setting up such a party is to establish an organisation of revolutionaries capable of leading the working people. According to Lenin, the main functions of this organisation should be to preserve a firm and stable organisation of leaders able to maintain continuity, to maintain close links between the leaders and the people, to ensure that the leaders take a professional approach, to centralise

leadership, and to develop the activity of rank-and-file members of the Party and steadily expand their membership. Dwelling on the selection of the party leaders, Lenin says in part: "The general control (in the literal sense of the term) exercised over every act of a party man in the political field brings into existence an automatically operating mechanism which produces what in biology is called the 'survival of the fittest'. 'Natural selection' by full publicity, election and general control provides the assurance that, in the last analysis, every political figure will be 'in his proper place', do the work for which he is best fitted by his powers and abilities, feel the effects of his mistakes on himself, and prove before all the world his ability to recognise mistakes and to avoid them". [49]

How should one organise the revolutionary action by the Party's rank-and-file members? "A basic political and organisational shortcoming of our movement is our *inability* to utilise all these forces and give them appropriate work." [50] How should one correct this situation? The organisation of revolutionaries is necessary, according to Lenin, precisely "to unite all these tiny factions into one whole, in order not to break up the movement while breaking up its functions, and in order to imbue the people who carry out the minute functions with the conviction that their work is necessary and important, without which conviction they will never do the work". [51] Centralisation in the work of the party, Lenin said, of necessity implies specialisation. He regarded "lack of specialisation" as "one of the most serious defects" in the party's organisational work. To set this situation right he suggested breaking down all tasks, and the stages at which they were to be carried out, into tiny operations. "The smaller each separate 'operation' in our common cause the more people we can find capable of carrying out such operations." [52] In this way a full-blooded system of party organisations can be set up, based on the principles of centralism and democracy.

Lenin raises another important question in his book, that of the party's role in the revolutionary movement. He concludes one of the last sections with the words: "That is what we should dream of!" Neither the Party leader nor the rank-and-file member will do much unless they have a clear perspective and keep in mind the general aim of the Party's struggle in the whirlpool of current affairs. Lenin

writes that the "revolution ... must not by any means be regarded as a single act ... but as a series of more or less powerful outbreaks rapidly alternating with periods of more or less complete calm". It would be a grievous mistake indeed to build the party organisation in anticipation only of outbreaks and street fighting, "or only upon the 'forward march of the drab everyday struggle' ". [53]

These are the more essential philosophical problems considered and analysed by Lenin in *What Is To Be Done?* A report given by the Social-Democratic organisations to the Second Congress of the RSDLP said that "*What Is To Be Done?* exerts a powerful influence on Russian leaders, a number of persons, as they have themselves acknowledged, becoming *Iskra*'s supporters because of it". [54] I. Radchenko, an *Iskra* agent, wrote after the publication of Lenin's book: "I use Lenin's plough everywhere as the best and most productive soil cultivator. It beautifully scrapes the crust from the routine and softens the soil that promises to bear fruit. Once weeds occur, sown by the *Rabocheye Dyelo*, it unfailingly uproots them. Wonderful!" [55]

What Is To Be Done? occupies a major place in the history of the struggle for a party of a new type. Developing Marxist theory, Lenin gave in *What Is To Be Done?* an annihilating criticism of revisionism which eulogised the theory of spontaneity. This criticism played an outstanding role in creating a genuinely revolutionary party of the proletariat, and in rallying the most advanced members of the working class and revolutionary intelligentsia on the basis of Lenin's ideas. When the Economists, in alliance with the Bund [56] members and the Mensheviks, tried, at the Second Party Congress, to uphold their position, most of the delegates sided with Lenin, thus laying the foundations for Bolshevism.

In his book *One Step Forward, Two Steps Back* Lenin showed the essence of the crisis in the Party, a crisis which arose as a result of the splitting activities of the Mensheviks. He stressed the theoretical significance of the struggle against Menshevism on organisational questions. "In its struggle for power the proletariat has no other weapon but organisation. ... The proletariat can, and inevitably will, become an invincible force only through its ideological unification on the principles of Marxism being reinforced by

the material unity of organisation, which welds millions of toilers into an army of the working class." [57] There is only one way to properly understand the essence of this process and that is to study the actual experience of the working-class movement. Lenin stressed: "Our struggle cannot be understood at all unless the concrete circumstances of each battle are studied. But once that is done, we see clearly that development does indeed proceed dialectically, by way of contradictions." [58]

In the course of his criticism of Menshevism Lenin showed the great significance of the dialectical method in pinpointing and accomplishing the tasks facing the Party. At the same time, he warned against an arbitrary interpretation of dialectics, against using it subjectively, as did Martov and other Menshevik leaders. He wrote: "The great Hegelian dialectics which Marxism made its own, having first turned it right side up, must never be confused with the vulgar trick of justifying the zigzags of politicians who swing over from the revolutionary to the opportunist wing of the Party, with the vulgar habit of lumping together ... particular developmental factors .... Dialectics ... studies the inevitable turns ... by a detailed study of the process of development in all its concreteness. One of the basic principles of dialectics is that there is no such thing as abstract truth, truth is always concrete .... And, one thing more, the great Hegelian dialectics should never be confused with that vulgar worldly wisdom so well expressed by the Italian saying: mettere la coda dove non va il capo (sticking in the tail where the head will not go through)." [59]

* * *

In his struggle for a party of a new type Lenin defended the major propositions of Marxist philosophy in the face of the distortions of the liberal Narodnik ideologists, the "legal Marxists", the Bernsteinians and their followers in Russia, the Economists and Mensheviks. In this struggle he enriched dialectical and historical materialism with crucially important tenets on the dialectic of the objective and the subjective, the spontaneous and the conscious in the social process, and on the dialectical unity of social knowledge and revolutionary action.

2. The Russian Revolution of 1905-1907

On the morning of January 10 (23), 1905, Lenin and Krupskaya, at the time in Geneva, went to the town library. On the way they met Anatoly Lunacharsky and his wife who told them about the events of January 9 in Petersburg. That very day Lenin wrote an article, "The Beginning of the Revolution in Russia" for the newspaper *Vperyod* [60] (Forward). In it, he defined the main tasks facing the working class in the conditions that had arisen. "The immediate arming of the workers and of all citizens in general," he wrote, "the preparation and organisation of the revolutionary forces for overthrowing the government authorities and institutions—this is the practical basis on which revolutionaries of every variety can and must unite to strike the common blow." At the same time, he warned that in this common struggle "the proletariat must always pursue its own independent path never weakening its connection with the Social-Democratic Party, always bearing in mind its great, ultimate objective, which is to rid mankind of all exploitation". [61]

The revolution in Russia confronted the Party head-on with the problem of the theory, strategy and tactics of the proletariat in the struggle to overthrow the autocracy and bring about bourgeois-democratic reforms in the economy, politics and culture of this vast country.

The Mensheviks, echoing the opportunistically-minded Western leaders of the Second International, considered that since the Russian revolution was bourgeois in nature the working class should not follow an independent tactics in it, let alone pursue strategic tasks and theory differing from those of the bourgeoisie. What is more, the Menshevik conference, held in Geneva, concurrently with the Third Congress of the RSDLP in April 1905, rejected Marx's idea on proletarian hegemony in the bourgeois revolution, and the policy of alliance between the working class and the peasantry, and voted against the Social-Democrats' participation in the provisional revolutionary government, so as "not to frighten off the bourgeoisie". This they did in opposition to the RSDLP Congress, led by Lenin, which adopted his strategic plan for the party in the incipient revolution. The Menshevik position objectively disarmed the working class and tended to completely subordinate the pro-

letariat to the interests of the liberal bourgeoisie. It was necessary not merely to expose the opportunism of the Mensheviks but to counter their ideas with clear-cut tenets of revolutionary Marxism on all the major issues in the theory and strategy of the proletarian Party under the prevailing conditions.

This important theoretical task was accomplished by Lenin in his book *Two Tactics of Social-Democracy in the Democratic Revolution,* which he wrote in June-July 1905, generalising from the events and experience of the first months of the Russian revolution. First of all Lenin stressed the close link between Marxist theory and the strategy and tactics of the Marxist Party. He provided a scientific definition of tactics: "By the Party's tactics we mean the Party's political conduct, or the character, direction, and methods of its political activity." [62] Tactical activities can in no way run counter to the Party's programme and main tasks. What role the working class will have in the revolution "depends on whether the working class will play the part of a subsidiary to the bourgeoisie, a subsidiary that is powerful in the force of its onslaught against the autocracy but impotent politically, or whether it will play the part of leader of the people's revolution". [63]

Lenin scientifically substantiated the answer to this question. The bourgeois revolution in Russia meant a democratic upheaval, i.e. the strengthening of bourgeois domination. At the same time, the proletariat was unable, at this stage of the revolution, to set itself the aim of seizing power to bring about a socialist revolution. Marx had said that in conditions of bourgeois-democratic revolution the workers are much more concerned with its victory than the bourgeoisie. The latter is invariably scared of the people, being afraid that in their revolutionary élan they will go much further than it desires. The bourgeoisie's role in the revolution is therefore always two-faced and half-hearted. It fears the people and is therefore ready to come to terms with the tsar and the landlords, betraying the interests of the people. All this leaves a special imprint on the proletariat's conduct in a bourgeois revolution.

Lenin wrote that though a bourgeois revolution above all expresses the interests of the capitalist class, it is "*in the highest degree advantageous to the proletariat*". This is because it removes the vestiges of feudal relations, serf-

dom and autocracy, and also because it opens wide vistas for the development of new productive forces, i.e. the basis for social progress as a whole. Finally, a victorious bourgeois revolution is advantageous to the proletariat because it brings the working people closer to the ultimate revolutionary abolition of all exploitation, i.e. to the victory of a socialist revolution.

It is therefore important for the proletarian party not merely to help the bourgeois revolution triumph, but to use this victory in the interests of the proletariat and all the working people. Lenin stressed that revolutionary Marxism "teaches the proletariat not to keep aloof from the bourgeois revolution, not to be indifferent to it, not to allow the leadership of the revolution to be assumed by the bourgeoisie but, on the contrary, to take a most energetic part in it, to fight most resolutely for consistent proletarian democratism, for the revolution to be carried to its conclusion".[64] By carrying revolution to its conclusion Lenin meant the revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry, rather than the organisation of the political power of the bourgeoisie. Marx had already concluded, generalising from the experience of the 1848-1849 revolutions in several European states, that the proletarian party must pursue the tactics in the bourgeois-democratic revolution, of establishing proletarian hegemony over this revolution. Marx did not specify the character of power to be established as a result of this hegemony, but made the point that the victory of the bourgeois-democratic revolution must lay the foundations for the transition from the bourgeois to the proletarian revolution. Lenin supplemented this conclusion by showing that this transition is realisable under a special form of power won by the people, i.e. the revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry.

At the same time, Lenin considered the question of why this form of power had to be precisely a dictatorship. First, because implementing the revolutionary transformations indispensable for the people will call forth the desperate resistance of the classes of the nobility and landlords overthrown by the revolution, and of the big bourgeoisie, whose interests run counter to the interests and requirements of the people. Secondly, only under a dictatorship can the proletariat carry out consistent democratic transformations completely. This dictatorship is not yet socialist, but demo-

cratic, i.e., it does not affect the foundations of bourgeois private-property relations, especially in the countryside. Nonetheless, wrote Lenin, the "significance of such a victory for the future development of Russia and of the whole world will be immense. Nothing will raise the revolutionary energy of the world proletariat so much, nothing will shorten the path leading to its complete victory to such an extent, as this decisive victory of the revolution". [65]

Lenin's conclusion on the nature of the power bound to arise as a result of the victory of the bourgeois-democratic revolution under proletarian hegemony is an all-important contribution to the Marxist theory of a social revolution, as it clearly demonstrates the aims and tasks of the proletarian party in the revolutionary movement of the masses.

Lenin enriched Marx's teaching in his analysis of the dialectics of the objective and subjective conditions attending the revolutionary struggle of the people in Russia at the turn of the century. The main objective condition for the success of the revolution, he said, was the "degree of Russia's economic development", while the major subjective condition for this process was the "degree of class-consciousness and organisation of the masses of the proletariat". [66] Furthermore, Lenin laid particular emphasis on the fact that objective and subjective conditions are always inextricably connected with one another and cannot be understood without taking account of their profound internal unity. Lenin drew particular attention to the need to take account of subjective conditions, since the "emancipation of the working classes must be won by the working classes themselves; a socialist revolution is out of the question unless the masses become class-conscious and organised, trained, and educated in an open class struggle against the entire bourgeoisie". [67] This brings out another crucial aspect of Lenin's theory of revolution, as formulated in *Two Tactics* . . ., viz. that the task of the revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry, i.e., of the provisional revolutionary government which arises as a result of the victory of the bourgeois-democratic revolution, is to work intensively on further unifying and organising the proletariat and the peasantry, and on educating them politically and ideologically to bring about the transition from the bourgeois to the socialist revolution.

At this time, Marxist literature lacked a sufficiently clear

and distinct definition of the concept "the people". Lenin filled this gap, noting in his book that the working classes, the proletariat and the peasantry, make up the core of this concept. At the same time, Lenin added that in conditions of a single revolutionary outburst this concept should also include the revolutionary-minded intelligentsia and that part of the petty-bourgeoisie in town and country that take the side of the workers and poor peasants in their struggle against the autocracy. The core of the people, its main and determining elements, are above all those who work, those who produce the material wealth of society, i.e. the proletariat and the working peasantry.

Proceeding from this, Lenin formulated the tasks facing the workers and peasants in the incipient revolution: "*The proletariat must carry the democratic revolution to completion, allying to itself the mass of the peasantry in order to crush the autocracy's resistance by force and paralyse the bourgeoisie's instability. The proletariat must accomplish the socialist revolution, allying to itself the mass of the semi-proletarian elements of the population, so as to crush the bourgeoisie's resistance by force and paralyse the instability of the peasantry and the petty bourgeoisie.*" [68] This conclusion was a major contribution to the Marxist theory of social revolution and the political action programme of the Bolsheviks and all the genuine revolutionary elements in the Russian working-class movement.

Lenin called the conclusion to his *Two Tactics* . . . "Dare We Win?". "Revolutions", he wrote, "are festivals of the oppressed and the exploited. At no other time are the mass of the people in a position to come forward so actively as creators of a new social order, as at a time of revolution." [69] In this way Lenin showed that the main, determining element in the revolution is the creation of the new, the creativity and revolutionary initiative of the broad masses, rather than the destruction of the old. In his conclusion he again stressed the anti-revolutionary character of the position held by the Mensheviks and other opportunists in the international and Russian working-class movement. The opportunists urged the proletariat to be passive and servile to the bourgeoisie, while Lenin and his followers advanced slogans which, as Lenin put it, are always "in advance of the revolutionary initiative of the masses, serve as a beacon, reveal to them our democratic and socialist

ideal in all its magnitude and splendour, and show them the shortest and most direct route to complete, absolute, and decisive victory".[70]

Lenin's *Two Tactics of Social-Democracy in the Democratic Revolution* was a major contribution to Marxist philosophy. In a number of important ways it enriched Marx's teaching on the revolutionary development of society and his theory of social revolution. When the book was published a prominent Bolshevik, S. Gusev, wrote to Lenin: "Your work, as I see it, will play a tremendous role, if it does not create a whole epoch. I am especially amazed at the revolutionary spirit which permeates it, and at its wonderfully clear and lucid style."[71] The tsar ordered the destruction of Lenin's book, but it spread all over Russia in tens of thousands of copies and served as the theoretical basis and militant action programme for the party of the proletariat in the revolutionary battles of 1905-1907.

During the first Russian revolution Lenin, though engrossed in political and revolutionary activity vigorously continued his efforts in the field of philosophy. The contribution he made to dialectical and historical materialism at this time is not just a matter of the theory of revolution, which he examined in his *Two Tactics* and other works. Mention should also be made of at least two other philosophical problems, which Lenin examined at this time, contributing greatly to Marx's theory of historical materialism.

The first problem is that of the partisanship of social knowledge in general and of Social-Democratic literature in particular. On November 8 (21), 1905, Lenin returned from emigration to Russia. In Petersburg he headed the editorial board of the newspaper *Novaya Zhizn* (New Life), which had virtually become the central organ of the RSDLP. Lenin more than once spoke at meetings of the RSDLP Petersburg Committee and at other Party conferences held on the board's premises. On November 13, the newspaper published his article "Party Organisation and Party Literature".

The partisanship of literature was an especially acute and urgent problem at this time. The general political strike of October 1905 made it possible to publish works that could not earlier be published in the legal press, and the difference between legal and illegal literature began to dis-

appear. The question of the partisanship of literature in general and the communist partisanship of Social-Democratic literature in particular therefore acquired fundamental importance.

Lenin said that earlier on, under tsarist censorship, the question of the Party character of literature was solved "extremely simply and in an extremely false and abnormal way. The entire illegal press was [or was considered—*L. S.*] a party press .... The entire legal press was non-party—since parties were banned". Hence many writers who were published legally showed "forced reserve, ... Aesopian language", and sometimes cowardice.[72] The revolution put an end to this situation, and in conditions of press freedom, Lenin stressed, literature "must become party literature". Lenin defined the Marxist concept of the party character of literature in detail. "Literature must become *part* of the common cause of the proletariat, 'a cog and a screw' of one single great Social-Democratic mechanism set in motion by the entire politically-conscious vanguard of the entire working class. Literature must become a component of organised, planned and integrated Social-Democratic Party work."[73] However, he made the proviso that the party spirit in literature should not in any way signify coercion on the part of the party towards writers and other public figures, such as artists, actors, scientists, and so on. The Marxist principle of partisanship means that any person has the right to express his opinions publicly. "But every voluntary association (including the party) is also free to expel members who use the name of the party to advocate anti-party views." Lenin makes the point here that freedom of speech must go hand in hand with freedom of alliance. "The party," he wrote, "is a voluntary association, which would inevitably break up, first ideologically and then physically, if it did not cleanse itself of people advocating anti-party views." What determines the boundary between that which is party and that which is anti-party? Lenin gives a clear-cut answer: "The party programme, the party's resolutions on tactics and its rules and, lastly, the entire experience of the international Social-Democracy".[74] Thus, the major methodological conclusion drawn by Lenin in his analysis of this problem is his view that freedom of speech and opinions is indissolubly connected with freedom of alliance and the freedom of like-

minded people to form groups with a right to a common stand and common views.

Lenin sharply criticised the abstract calls for freedom "in general", so typical of bourgeois propaganda. "The freedom of the bourgeois writer, artist or actress," he writes, "is simply masked (or hypocritically masked) dependence on the money-bag, on corruption, on prostitution." [75]

Lenin contrasted the hypocrisy of bourgeois literature with the genuinely humanistic attitude towards its ideological content, an attitude which reflects the interests of the overwhelming majority of the working people. Only truly party literature, he says, can be genuinely free. In a society which will promote the working people's goals and aspirations and in which all the people will be united by the great ideals of communism the party attitude to these ideas will of necessity fuse with genuinely scientific and at the same time highly humanistic consciousness. This literature will be inspired by the greatest ideas of scientific socialism. It will serve millions upon millions of working people, not a handful of money-bags. "It will be a free literature, enriching the last word in the revolutionary thought of mankind with the experience and living work of the socialist proletariat, bringing about permanent interaction between the experience of the past (scientific socialism, the completion of the development of socialism from its primitive, utopian forms) and the experience of the present (the present struggle of the worker comrades)." [76] The party character of literature is nothing but its unity with the struggle for the emancipation of the working people.

Throughout the subsequent development of Marxist theory and practice, Lenin's article "Party Organisation and Party Literature" has served as the methodological basis for approaching the problem of partisanship in ideological work. Its ideas have been realised in the work of the scientists, writers and artists who crossed over to join the revolution. After the October Revolution of 1917, Lenin's standpoint underlay the Party's efforts to create a new, socialist literature and an entire culture for Soviet society. Party documents and decisions on ideological questions are based on the ideas and recommendations contained in the article. Its significance for Marxist theory can hardly be overestimated.

One more philosophical problem considered by Lenin dur-

ing the first Russian revolution was that of the attitude to be taken by the Marxist party towards religion. On December 3, 1905, *Novaya Zhizn* published Lenin's article "Socialism and Religion". During the 1905 revolution, Russia's religious organisations and above all the Orthodox church, which loyally supported the autocracy, conducted active counter-revolutionary activities in an attempt to tear the working people away from the revolutionary struggle and to reduce them to obedience. The revolutionary proletarian party had to determine what attitude to take to religious ideology and the church in the conditions arising after the revolution.

In its attitude to religion revolutionary Social-Democracy proceeded from Marx and Engels' view of religion as a special form of social consciousness. Marx's words that religion is the opium of the people and that a scientific socialist world view is incompatible wth religious ideology are well known to all.[77] Lenin further developed Marx's propositions with regard to the new historical conditions of social development.

Lenin recalled the famous Marxist proposition that religion is unconditionally and resolutely opposed to social progress. "Religion," he noted, "is one of the forms of spiritual oppression which everywhere weighs down heavily upon the masses of the people."[78] However, the proletariat's incipient large-scale revolutionary struggle against capitalism puts an end to the domination of this "spiritual booze, frees the workers from their belief in life after death by welding them together to fight in the present for a better life on earth".[79] While on a general social plane Marxists consider religion to be the private affair of each man or woman, i.e. they insist on the separation of church from the state, in relation to their own Party they can on no account leave it to the discretion of individual members. The party recognises the right of every person, including those making up the proletariat, to freely profess the views and ideas in which he believes. Yet it is the duty of each party member as a representative of the politically conscious vanguard of the working class, which has adopted genuinely scientific positions excluding religious consciousness, to explain to the workers and all the working people the essence of the scientific, atheistic world outlook as the only true and genuinely humanistic view of the world, its

essence, origin and development. What distinguishes the attitude of the proletarian party to religion from that of all the other political organisations in bourgeois society is that it propagandises scientific knowledge and educates the working people on the real facts and conclusions of science, rather than trying to violently eradicate religious delusions.

Later on, in 1909, when the Party was struggling against the reactionary theory of "God seeking" [80] and the revisionist "God-building" [81] (see next section for more details), Lenin wrote an article, "The Attitude of the Workers' Party to Religion". In this article he again returned to Marx and Engels' views on religion, and pinpointed the significance of pre-Marxian materialism in exposing the reactionary social role of religion. He also demonstrated the essence of dialectical materialism, the only scientific world view that is in principle hostile to all religious theories. At the same time, Lenin wrote: "We must not only admit workers who preserve their belief in God into the Social-Democratic Party, but must deliberately set out to recruit them; we are absolutely opposed to giving the slightest offence to their religious convictions, but we recruit them in order to educate them in the spirit of our programme." [82] In his articles Lenin expounded and developed the main principles of proletarian atheism and the Party's policy towards religion and the church. These works were an important contribution to the social theory of Marxism and the materialist conception of history.

3. Materialism and Empirio-Criticism

Lenin's book *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism* is his chief philosophical work. Its unfading theoretical significance lies in the fact that, from the standpoint of science and practice in the early 20th century, it provides a systematic exposition of the main philosophical problems of Marxism and answers the fundamental theoretical questions facing the Party in its efforts to stimulate a new revolutionary upsurge in the working-class movement. At the same time, it generalised the latest experiments in natural science from the Marxist philosophical standpoint, and showed the importance of the union between dialectical

materialism and the special sciences, setting forth the basic principles inherent in Marxist criticism of bourgeois philosophy and revisionism.

Lenin's book was written at a time when proletarian revolutions were being spurred on by social development in the capitalist countries, when the oppressed peoples were intensifying their struggle for emancipation, i.e. when the preconditions for society's entry into a new historical epoch, that of the transition from capitalism to socialism, were being created.

Lenin's book was written during the severe tsarist reaction which followed the defeat of the revolution. Police terror was established in Russia, revolutionaries were mercilessly persecuted by the tsarist authorities. In the ideological field there was a fierce struggle between reactionary, idealistic theories, and progressive, materialist ones. The legal press was dominated by mysticism, free rein being given to the reactionary school of "God-seeking", which preached a 'return to religion'. Literature and art eulogised individualism, withdrawal from politics and rejection of the revolutionary and materialist traditions of Russian culture. Several unreliable Social-Democrats crossed over to positions of revisionism and bourgeois ideology. In these conditions the ideological struggle and defence of Marxist philosophy from all kinds of attacks and distortions became especially relevant.

Especially dangerous for the Bolsheviks was the philosophical crusade launched by Bogdanov and his followers in the midst of the Party against Marxism. Lenin wrote to Maxim Gorky: "I have been following Bogdanov's writings on philosophy since his energeticist book, 'The Historical View of Nature' .... In the summer of 1906 ... it became clearer to me than ever that he was on an absolutely wrong track, not the Marxist track. I thereupon wrote him a 'declaration of love', a letter on philosophy taking up three notebooks .... I am sorry now that I did not have them published at the moment." [83]

From this time on, Lenin repeatedly criticised Bogdanov's philosophical ideas in discussions, pointing to the need to fight to safeguard the purity of Marxist theory and to uphold the significance of this struggle in implementing the Party's practical and political tasks. Bogdanov, however, continued to advocate his ideas. In 1908, he sponsored

and contributed to the collection of articles, *Studies in the Philosophy of Marxism,*[84] whose publication prompted Lenin to write his *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism.* "Now the 'Studies in the Philosophy of Marxism' have appeared. I have read all the articles except Suvorov's (I am reading it now), and every article made me furiously indignant. No, no, this is not Marxism! Our empirio-critics, empiriomonists, and empirio-symbolists are floundering in a bog." [85]

At first Lenin intended opposing Bogdanov's theory with a series of articles or a pamphlet.[86] He made a thorough study of the latest Machist writings and works on natural science in the libraries of Geneva and London, leaving Switzerland for England in May 1908 to study in the British Museum. As Lenin's library tickets and the references in his book show, he studied more than two hundred books and articles by various authors.

Lenin's book was published in May 1909. This was a historic event in the life of the party and in the development of Marxist philosophy. For the first time since Engels, Lenin gave a systematic Marxist analysis of the development of the natural and social sciences. In it, he showed the full greatness of Marxist scientific philosophy in the new historical conditions, and the harm done to the cause of the proletariat by the numerous "critics" of Marx among the bourgeois philosophers and their revisionist allies, people who were seeking to denigrate and distort the essence of Marxist materialism and its revolutionary dialectics.

In his work Lenin in fact developed all the basic tenets of dialectical materialism. He showed the essence and significance of Marx's teaching on matter and the forms of its existence, examined the unity of materialism and dialectics in Marxist philosophy, comprehensively analysed and systematised the dialectico-materialist theory of reflection and the main categories of Marxist epistemology, and dwelt on practice as the basis, source and criterion of the truth of human knowledge. He also pointed out the main trends in the development of world philosophical thought and formulated the basic principles for a Marxist assessment of bourgeois philosophical theories and revisionism. He drew scientific philosophical conclusions from the latest discoveries in natural science, revealed the essence of the crisis in

physics and assessed the incipient revolution in natural science over how one should understand the laws and essence of developing matter.

Lenin's book further developed the Marxist principle of the partisanship of philosophy and generalised the fundamental questions of historical materialism in connection with the Machist critique of Marxism. Lenin's work armed the Party ideologically in its struggle to solve the theoretical and political problems posed by the approaching new revolution and to defeat all the anti-Marxist theories. Its ideas provided the ideological foundation on which all the advanced members of the working class and revolutionary intelligentsia rallied around Lenin.

Generations of Communists have studied Marxist philosophy from Lenin's work. It would be no exaggeration to say that at the beginning of the 20th century this was a genuine encyclopaedia of Marxist philosophy. Far from diminishing, its significance has been steadily growing with time. The book continues to pinpoint ever new aspects to solving the modern problems of Marxist-Leninist theory and practice, aspects brilliantly predicted by Lenin many years ago.

Lenin prefaced his work with his famous "Ten Questions to a Lecturer". Leaving for London in the spring of 1908, he wrote these for Innokenty Dubrovinsky who, as a member of the Bolshevik centre, had to speak at a discussion of a lecture given by Bogdanov in Geneva at the end of May. Bogdanov tried to replace the materialism of the "Plekhanov" (i.e. Marxist) school with his "empiriomonism". Lenin was unable to speak out in person against this anti-Marxist trick and asked Dubrovinsky to do so in his stead.

Lenin's "Ten Questions to a Lecturer" were a kind of draft for his future work. The first question reads: "Does the lecturer acknowledge that the philosophy of Marxism is *dialectical materialism?*" [87] Then Lenin asks whether Bogdanov recognises the division of philosophical systems into two groups, materialism and idealism, and whether he agrees that for the materialist the unity of the world consists in its materiality, while cognition is based on the reflection of the material world in human consciousness. The next questions concern the problems of motion, causality, law and other categories in Marxist philosophy. The

last three questions demonstrate the connection between Bogdanov's views and Machism, and between the latter and the Immanentist reactionary school and philosophical clericalism, showing the utter fallacy of Bogdanov's claims to propound "Bolshevik philosophy".

Thus Lenin's draft revealed the main positions of the philosophy of dialectical materialism, as compared with the "empirio-monism" advocated by Bogdanov and his followers; it also demonstrated the place and significance of Machism among the other idealist philosophical schools and showed its social, party essence in the ideological struggle between Marxism and bourgeois philosophy. Finally, it demonstrated that Bolshevik practices are based on the granite foundations of Marx's dialectical materialism.

"Marx and Engels," Lenin wrote, "scores of times termed their philosophical views dialectical materialism." [88] This means that the scientific socialism they discovered arose and developed precisely on the foundations of dialectical materialist philosophy and did not need any special "Bolshevik philosophy". Bogdanov's claims, Lenin showed, were nothing but an attempt to replace genuine Marxist philosophy with an idealist bourgeois theory borrowed from the arsenal of late 19th-century "professorial philosophy", which specialised in fighting Marxism and dialectical materialism.

Lenin proved that Marx's dialectical materialism, which Bogdanov called "the materialism of the Plekhanov school", was actually a single teaching that cannot be divided into specifically identifiable parts. "From this Marxist philosophy," Lenin said, "which is cast from a single piece of steel, you cannot eliminate one basic premise, one essential part, without departing from objective truth, without falling a prey to bourgeois-reactionary falsehood." [89]

Only this single and integral theory of Marxism, in which dialectical materialism is organically fused with a materialist conception of history and scientific socialism, can provide the proletariat with genuine knowledge of the actual laws determining the development of both the objective world and its reflection in human consciousness. Hence it is not the task of Marxist philosophers to invent "new" conceptions, but to thoroughly study the wealth of ideas which Marx and Engels left to the proletarian parties and

to consciously use and develop these ideas with an eye to the new social practice and science. Lenin thus set the Party the task of studying the classical legacy of Marxism, not in a spirit of dogmatism, but to assimilate the whole wealth of the theoretical arsenal of Marxism so as to use it creatively to solve new tasks posed by the theory and practice of revolutionary struggle. Studying Marx, he said, means learning to use the valuable methods he created for scientifically analysing reality and being guided by the fundamental principles of philosophical materialism and dialectical theory he discovered. Lenin stressed that "by following the *path* of Marxian theory we shall draw closer and closer to objective truth (without ever exhausting it); but by following *any other path* we shall arrive at nothing but confusion and lies". [90]

In the introductory part which he entitled "In Lieu of an Introduction" Lenin classified the epistemological sources of empirio-monism. He showed that the English idealist, George Berkeley, had right back in 1710 formulated the basic postulates of subjective idealism which asserted that human sensations and their objects were one and the same thing. This led directly to solipsism, i.e. negation of the objective world existing outside and independent of human consciousness. Berkeley declared the whole outside world to be a "combination of sensations" evinced in human consciousness by God that created the world.

Thus in the late 19th century, when Marxist philosophy was becoming increasingly popular among both advanced workers and progressive intellectuals a supposedly "new school" arose, called Machism after its founder, Ernst Mach. It asserted that man only dealt with his sensations, whose content is made up of the variety of objects and phenomena surrounding him. Machism declared the real world to be a "complex of sensations", existing for men only in their consciousness.

Lenin demonstrated the similarity between Berkeley's and Mach's premises and emphasised that Bogdanov and his supporters who claimed to have made the "latest discoveries" in philosophy, were in fact repeating the well-known anti-materialist schemes of the old idealists. And he set the clear-cut propositions of dialectical materialism against these schemes.

Lenin proved that the division of all philosophy into two

main trends—materialism and idealism—was also characteristic of the most recent philosophy. The claims of the Machists and, following them, of Bogdanov, to a "third" way, apparently superior to materialism and idealism was nothing but a veiled apology for idealism, a way of fighting the increasing international prestige of Marxism.

Bogdanov's theory was especially harmful and dangerous in the conditions of reaction that set in after the defeat of the first Russian revolution, when despondency and confusion overcame various Party members, particularly petty-bourgeois intellectuals. Therefore Lenin countered with a logical account of the principles of philosophical materialism.

He defined the essence of philosophical materialism as follows: "Materialism, in full agreement with natural science, takes matter as primary and regards consciousness, thought, sensation as secondary." [91] According to Lenin, recognition of dialectical materialism as the only true outlook on the world is not just a question of theory, but also the basis of human activity, i.e. it is a practical political question which directly concerns the fate of the Party and the working class and their struggle to rebuild the world on revolutionary lines.

It is here that Lenin gives his famous definition of matter as a philosophical category: "Matter is a philosophical category denoting the objective reality which is given to man by his sensations, and which is copied, photographed and reflected by our sensations, while existing independently of them." [92] The methodological significance of this definition is very great. If the world exists according to objective laws and man can cognise these laws and learn to use them consciously in struggling to achieve his aims, then there are no tasks that he will not be able to cope with. Hence the activity of individuals, and all the more so of their associations, such as parties and classes, is bound to succeed if it is based on knowledge and use of the objective laws of the material world. The historical optimism of this tenet, as of all Marxist theory, gives the working people confidence in the final victory of their cause and rallies them in the struggle against ideological enemies. And conversely, the theory preached by the Machists and Bogdanovites, who set man against the surrounding world, could only weaken the unity and cohesion of the

masses, their will to action and their resolve to fight the enemies of progress.

Revealing the essence of philosophical materialism, Lenin showed the substance of such categories as motion, time, and space to be in unity with matter, of which they are different forms of existence.

Lenin's theory of reflection was a great contribution to the development of dialectical materialism. He briefly defined its content as follows: "Things exist outside us. Our perceptions and ideas are their images. Verification of these images, differentiation between true and false images, is given by practice." [93] A historical digression is relevant here. The essence of the theory of reflection was formulated by Engels in his *Dialectics of Nature*. At the turn of the century Machism declared Engels' views "outdated" and his concept of reflection an absolutisation of the "passivity" of human consciousness which this theory "dooms" to passively copy reality. Lenin refuted these allegations by showing that Engels and Marxism as a whole for that matter, refers to actively transforming the world rather than passively reflecting it. He writes: "Until we know a law of nature, it, existing and acting independently of and outside our mind, makes us slaves of 'blind necessity'. But once we come to know this law . . . we become the masters of nature. The mastery of nature manifested in human practice is a result of an objectively correct reflection within the human head of the phenomena and processes of nature." [94]

On this basis Lenin formulated three important epistemological conclusions. The first reads: "Things exist independently of our consciousness, independently of our sensations, outside of us." The second: "There is definitely no difference in principle between the phenomenon and the thing-in-itself and there cannot be any such difference. The only difference is between what is known and what is not yet known." And the third reads: "In the theory of knowledge . . . we must think dialectically, that is, we must not regard our knowledge as ready-made and unalterable, but must determine how *knowledge* emerges from *ignorance*, how incomplete, inexact knowledge becomes more complete and more exact." [95]

Lenin specified these positions by analysing the actual process of reflection. He began with the simplest, primary

acts of reflection, with human sensations. "Sensation," he wrote, "is indeed the direct connection between consciousness and the external world; it is the transformation of the energy of external excitation into the fact of consciousness." [96]

Formulating the main principles of the theory of reflection, Lenin wrote: "Matter acting upon our sense-organs produces sensation. Sensation depends on the brain, nerves, retina, etc., i.e. on matter organised in a particular way. The existence of matter does not depend on sensation. Matter is primary. Sensation, thought, consciousness are the supreme product of matter organised in a particular way." [97]

Thus, Lenin showed that reflection underlies the whole process of man's cognition of the objective world. The philosophical theory of Marxism has to disclose the nature of man's reflection of the objective world, the basic forms of its development, and the mutual transition of these forms in the process of interaction between human society and surrounding nature.

The process of reflection can be subdivided into three main types, according to the three main forms taken by the self-motion of matter—physico-chemical, biological and social. The first type, the most widespread, is characteristic of inorganic nature. The second arises at the stage of living matter. The third appears at the social level as a specific reflection of the objective world in individual and social consciousness.

Common to these three types, Lenin said, is the material world, as the object of reflection, and also the principle of dialectical interaction between the reflected and the reflecting. At the same time, each type of reflection has its specific features and is in turn subdivided into a whole series of different kinds of reflection.

In inanimate nature reflection is indissolubly linked with the transfer of energy potentially contained in material bodies. For instance, when a body emits light or sound waves on to a surface the photons or waves are reflected from that surface depending on the intensity of the source of light (emission) and the nature of interaction between this source and the reflecting surface (screen).

In animate nature one should distinguish between the three main types of reflection.

Ontogeny = the life cycle of a single organism; biological development of the individual.
Ontological argument = an a priori argument for the existence of god.

The first is the phenomenon of irritability which determines the behaviour of living beings on the basis of information obtained from without. For instance, the simplest animals have two reactions, that of defence and the feeding reflex. At higher levels irritability is manifested in many reactions (defence, flight, attack, the feeding reflex, sexual instinct, etc.).

The second type of reflection in living matter is genetic information, i.e. the consolidation over several generations of the ontogenetic features obtained. This phenomenon underlies the law of natural selection in biological evolution (The Law of Evolution) discovered by Charles Darwin.

The third type of reflection is conditioned-reflex activity which appears in higher animals. These are the rudiments of reflection at the level of higher nervous activity, determining the prime regulation of their life and the higher animals' self-regulation. This gives rise to a number of unconditioned reflexes (building breeding places, organising collective defence and attack, bringing up the young, being selective over food and conditions of existence, etc.).

The highest type of reflection is reflection in the social process, at the level of human consciousness. Mention must here be made of the following forms: (1) reflection of the individual determining his behaviour and the aims of his activity; (2) reflection of the world in the form of concepts, i.e. scientific cognition of the world, which is a social rather than an individual process; (3) reflection of the world in images, i.e. artistic reproduction in literature and the art of man's interaction with the outside world, which is also social in nature; (4) reflection in the sphere of organisation, which supplies people with information concerning the specific development and regularisation of social life itself, as realised in the management of social processes; (5) and, finally, the emergence of the technical, machine types of reflection which, specific only to social life, limitlessly extend people's powers in achieving the aims they have set themselves.

All these types of reflection are united by features common to social reflection, such as a conscious attitude to the world, the use of the second signalling system, i.e., speech and thought, goal-directed and purposeful reflective activity, a desire to cognise the laws of matter and consciously use them in practical activity, and finally the revolu-

tionary struggle for the genuinely humanistic aims of cognition and practice and against all types of social injustice, violence, natural and social calamities.

Machism attempted to contrast its subjectivistic and idealistic theories to the dialectical materialist theory of reflection, asserting that fact is everything that belongs to consciousness. Thus the connection between fact and the objective world was passed over in silence or denied altogether. Lenin contrasted this idealistic interpretation with a clear-cut formula: "Sensation is the subjective image of the objective world." He thus indissolubly connected any fact with its objective existence in reality. And consciousness reflects this fact in a corresponding, i.e. correct, way. The criterion of this correctness is people's social practice, which shows whether a particular interpretation of outside phenomena and processes is true or false.

Lenin made an important contribution to the dialectical materialist doctrine of truth. He showed that truth is the adequate reflection in human consciousness of objective reality, which exists outside and independently of the cognising subject.

The human brain, Lenin wrote, is the most highly organised form of matter. The ways the brain reflects the objective world are subjective, because they are peculiar precisely to the brain with its special nature, structure and functions. Yet the content of reflection is objective, as it does not depend on people's will or wish. It is the objective nature of its content that makes it possible to cognise the material world as it is.

The cognition of the truth is an endless process of extending human knowledge, which, based on earlier information about the object being cognised, continuously develops in the course of man's interaction with the outside world.

One of the central questions in the Marxist-Leninist doctrine of truth is that of its objective character. Apart from this, the problem of truth includes the dialectic of the absolute and the relative in the process of cognition. Finally, an important aspect of the doctrine of truth is its concrete nature.

The problem of truth cannot be understood outside an analysis of the dialectic of the subject and object. Since the people's social consciousness is made up of an endless

variety of individual consciousnesses it might seem that the objectivity of truth includes something average, derivative from the endless totality of subjective truths arising in the consciousness of individuals. Idealist philosophy solves this problem precisely in this way. But in principle this approach is wrong.

Lenin defines objective truth as an entity of human concepts and notions that "does not depend on a subject, that does not depend either on a human being or on humanity".[98] This definition is based on the fundamental proposition of materialism that the reflected object, i.e. the material world, exists prior to, outside and independently of the reflecting subject. And if this is the case the source of knowing the world can only be the world itself, and the idealists' claims to a "superphysical", "intuitive"—interpreted as something which does not reflect the outer world cognition are devoid of any meaning whatsoever. Truth may only be objective, or it is simply no truth.

The cognition of truth is a process whereby human knowledge extends dialectically, i.e. continuity is cognised through the discrete, infinity is cognised through the finite, the general is cognised through the particular, etc. What, then, does the cognition of the discrete, the finite and the particular represent in the cognition of the truth of the continuous, the infinite and the general?

Recognition of objective truth means recognition of the possibility of cognising absolute truth in principle, i.e. of gaining profound and full knowledge of the world. But the world never stands still, it is always developing and changing. Hence, while recognising the fundamental possibility of knowing the whole variety of objective reality as it develops, philosophical materialism at the same time considers the cognition of absolute truth an endless process, a constant approximation to absolute truth, which includes at the same time an element of continuity.

This process consists of an endless totality of cognised relative truths. Lenin wrote: "Human thought then by its nature is capable of giving, and does give, absolute truth, which is compounded of a sum-total of relative truths. Each step in the development of science adds new grains to the sum of absolute truth, but the limits of the truth of each scientific proposition are relative, now expanding, now shrinking with the growth of knowledge."[99] Hence the ab-

solute and the relative are fused together in objective truth. From the standpoint of dialectical materialism the limits of our knowledge's approximation to absolute truth are historically conditional and relative. But since the constantly realised possibility of cognising absolute truth is objective, each relative, partial or one-sided truth contains a particle, grain or shoot of absolute truth.

"The materialist dialectics of Marx and Engels," wrote Lenin, "certainly does contain relativism, but is not reducible to relativism, that is, it recognises the relativity of all our knowledge, not in the sense of denying objective truth, but in the sense that the limits of approximation of our knowledge to this truth are historically conditional." [100]

Unlike agnosticism, Lenin said, Marxism teaches that our sensations, perceptions and other forms of reflection provide us with a true, adequate picture of the world. And this means that every step in the reflection by human consciousness of objective things and phenomena is a step forward in cognising the material world. Each such step gives only incomplete, limited knowledge—relative truth. But in their sum-total these relative truths bring humanity increasingly closer to the cognition of absolute truth.

Lenin showed that the dialectics of absolute and relative truth has two main aspects. First, recognition of the dialectics of reflection assures man that he is capable of solving any cognitive tasks arising in his activity. This position serves in dialectical materialism as the basis for dealing with the second aspect of the fundamental question of philosophy, which asserts the fundamental possibility of cognising the world. Second, the theory of reflection shows that each separate step in cognition is relative, while bringing us nearer to cognising absolute truth.

Lenin specially stressed this element of the relativity of our knowledge. He wrote: "Dialectics—as Hegel in his time explained—*contains* an element of relativism, of negation, of scepticism, but *is not reducible* to relativism. [101]

Lenin introduces one more concept, that of objective truth. He defines the essence of this as the content of our concepts and notions which depends neither on man nor on mankind. Hence he makes another important conclusion: in so far as the recognition of the objective world, correctly reflected in our consciousness, gives us objective truth, the laws of reflection of this world in people's consciousness

Fideism = the belief that faith alone is the basis of knowledge rather than reason.
Epigoni = inferior follower.

cannot differ in any way from the laws dominating the objective world itself.

To substantiate this provision Lenin provided a far-going description of social practice as the only true criterion of the truth of our knowledge. "For the materialist the 'success' of human practice proves the correspondence between our ideas and the objective nature of the things we perceive. If we include the criterion of practice in the foundation of the theory of knowledge we inevitably arrive at materialism." [102]

Lenin's analysis of the general philosophical problems of Marxism and the Marxist theory of reflection has considerably enriched the theoretical arsenal of dialectical and historical materialism.

Lenin considered the ways that Marxist philosophy would develop and its prospects for doing so while criticising the place and role of Machism in philosophy at the turn of the century. "We demand of nature obedience to law. The bourgeoisie demands reaction of its professors," [103] he wrote. And Lenin showed that in classical German philosophy all materialists, from Feuerbach to Marx and Engels, took to the left from Kant, the founder of this philosophy, proceeding to the complete negation of all idealism and agnosticism. Machism, however, and all its allies in the Second International, followed idealism. In the section "In What Direction Is Empirio-Criticism Developing?" Lenin provided irrefutable proof of the similarity of Mach's ideas to several more reactionary schools of idealism which directly coincided with Fideism.

Of great value in Lenin's book is his defence and development of Marx's dialectical theory. Lenin called Russian Machists "wretched epigoni of the contemporary philosophers who imagined that they had destroyed Hegel when in reality they had reverted to a repetition of the pre-Hegelian errors of Kant and Hume". [104] In this context he showed up several mistakes made by Plekhanov, who did not defend dialectical materialism against Machism with sufficient consistency and precision. Specifically while expounding the materialist theory of knowledge, Plekhanov did not correctly interpret Mach's conception of "experience", identifying it in fact with practice. Meanwhile the Machists used this concept solely to denote the sum of man's subjective sensations, i.e. they completely divorced

experience from people's real interaction with the surrounding world. Similarly, referring to the content of sensations, Plekhanov erroneously interpreted the so-called theory of hieroglyphs which maintained that the content of sensations and perceptions did not correspond to what is reflected in them. Lenin revealed the inaccuracies in the thought of Plekhanov and certain other Marxists and stressed the need to judge the theories hostile to Marxism with complete clarity and precision.

One of the Machists' major objectives was to use the latest breakthroughs in natural science to substantiate their own theoretical position. Lenin considered this question in his chapter "The Recent Revolution in Natural Science, and Philosophical Idealism", in which he defined crucial concepts, such as the crisis in physics at the turn of the century, the physical idealism that arose from this crisis, and the revolution in natural science.

By the end of the 19th century, a stable equilibrium had appeared to set in in cognising the physical picture of the world. All physical processes seemed to fit clearly into the theory of classical physics and professors often did not advise young people to specialise in physics, where everything seemed to be clear, once and for all.

Yet two small clouds appeared on this seemingly cloudless horizon. One of these was the problem that, according to classical concepts, light was transmitted via space by ether and was consequently subject to the same laws of composition of velocities as the velocity of sound emitted on the air. A direct experiment to prove this was conducted by Michelson in 1881, and repeated jointly with Morley in 1887. In this experiment a light ray falling on a screen parallel or perpendicular to the motion of the Earth had, according to the ether theory, to amplify or diminish according to the law of composition of velocities. This did not happen, however, and the negative result could only be explained by one thing, namely that the hypothesis on the existence of ether was not correct. Yet abandoning "ether" and recognising the velocity of light as a constant ran counter to the ideas of classical physics and undermined its foundations.

The other "cloud" was the discovery, in the late 19th century, of radioactivity, the X-rays and, especially, the electron, a component of the atom. Moreover, it transpired

that the electron's mass was subject to change depending on its velocity. The existence of radioactivity gave grounds for supposing that colossal amounts of energy are concealed inside the atom.

The idealists interpreted these discoveries as the "disappearance" of matter whose basis had earlier been ascribed to indivisible atoms and ether. Lenin evaluated these discoveries in a different light. "The *essence* of the crisis in modern physics," he wrote, "consists in the break-down of the old laws and basic principles." [105]

This extension of our knowledge of matter has led to spectacular progress in 20th-century science.

Lenin gave a lucid philosophical materialist interpretation of the latest discoveries in physics. "'Matter disappears'," he wrote, "means that the limit within which we have hitherto known matter disappears and that our knowledge is penetrating deeper... For the *sole* 'property' of matter with whose recognition philosophical materialism is bound up is the property of *being an objective reality*, of existing outside the mind." [106]

Lenin's positions on the essence and importance of the latest discoveries in physics are of tremendous methodological significance to the subsequent development of Marxist philosophy in its close union with advanced natural sciences. Of special importance here is Lenin's thesis that the new data obtained by physics (or any other special sciences) face scientists with the urgent task of understanding dialectical materialism and applying it to the object of their discoveries.

"Modern physics is in travail, it is giving birth to dialectical materialism," [107] wrote Lenin. He showed that "'physical' idealism ... exactly like the 'physiological' idealism of yesterday, merely signifies that one school of natural scientists in one branch of natural science has slid into a reactionary philosophy, being unable to rise directly and at once from metaphysical materialism to dialectical materialism." [108]

Lenin demonstrated a genuinely scientific way of further cognising the world, indissolubly linked with the philosophy of dialectical materialism. "The electron is as *inexhaustible* as the atom," [109] he said. The subsequent emergence of atomic and then nuclear physics has brilliantly confirmed this profound prediction. The prominent 20th-century

scientists Paul Langevin, Frédéric Joliot-Curie, Sergei Vavilov, John Bernal, Bruno Pontecorvo and others often noted the beneficient impact of Marxist-Leninist methodology and philosophy, which enabled them to make outstanding discoveries in their fields of knowledge.

Finally, in his *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism* Lenin set forth a number of fundamental problems of historical materialism in connection with his criticism of the Russian Machists. Central to these problems was the development and substantiation of the Marxist principle of the partisanship of philosophy. The Machists claimed a "third" way in philosophy which supposedly stood above the struggle between materialism and idealism. Lenin showed that these claims in fact served to disguise the most reactionary views and the actual idealistic and metaphysical positions of this philosophy. He stressed that "Marx and Engels were partisans in philosophy from start to finish, they were able to detect the deviations from materialism and concessions to idealism and fideism in every one of the 'recent' trends." [110] Referring to the contemporary idealists, Lenin said: "Behind the epistemological scholasticism of empirio-criticism one must not fail to see the struggle of parties in philosophy, a struggle which in the last analysis reflects the tendencies and ideology of the antagonistic classes in modern society. Recent philosophy is as partisan as was philosophy two thousand years ago." [111]

Lenin's *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism* is a great work of Marxist philosophy, a work that has for over half a century been instrumental in educating millions of Communists and progressives in the Marxist-Leninist spirit all over the world. It has been and always will be a brilliant example of the creative development of Marxist philosophy, indissolubly fusing abundant positive content with a merciless ideological exposure of the bourgeois and revisionist opponents of dialectical materialism. The principles of the criticism of bourgeois philosophy and revisionism expounded in *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism* provided Communists with a militant weapon in their struggle to purify and further develop Marxist theory.

4. The Struggle Against Revisionism and Bourgeois Philosophy

Lenin did much to criticise and expose the many trends of bourgeois and revisionist ideology, notably revisionism, various petty-bourgeois theories, and the ideology of counter-revolutionary liberalism.

Revisionism was dealt with in Lenin's article "Marxism and Revisionism" written in the spring of 1908. It dwelt on a major methodological problem, criticising the roots of international revisionism and its philosophical essence. By the 1890s, Lenin said, Marxism had won a decisive victory in the working-class movement. But "after Marxism had ousted all the more or less integral doctrines hostile to it, the tendencies expressed in those doctrines began to seek other channels".[112] Revisionism, as an attempt to revise the main tenets of Marx's theory in the guise of "amendments" to it, expressed in social terms the bourgeois ideologists' desire to again bring the working-class movement under their influence from within, with the help of leaders disguised as Marxists. The ideological content of revisionism was nothing new. "In the sphere of philosophy," Lenin wrote, "revisionism followed in the wake of bourgeois professorial 'science' ".[113] In the political field revisionism opposed the revolutionary foundations of the Marxist-Leninist theory of class struggle and proletarian dictatorship. "To determine its conduct from case to case, to adapt itself to the events of the day and to the chopping and changing of petty politics, to forget the primary interests of the proletariat,"[114] this was how Lenin described the political stand adopted by the revisionists.

Fundamental importance attaches to Lenin's description of the social basis of revisionism. Lenin had to struggle from the 1890s onwards against attempts to distort the revolutionary essence of Marx's ideas, both from the right, i.e. from the position of opportunistic conciliation with the bourgeoisie, and from the left, i.e. from the position of extremism and "super-revolutionariness". As for right revisionism (Bernsteinism), Lenin said that its social basis in the working-class movement was the section of petty-bourgeois entrepreneurs who, under capitalism, tend to go bankrupt and replenish the ranks of the proletariat. In this way the "petty-bourgeois world-outlook should again

and again crop up in the ranks of the broad workers' parties".[115] This section of workers from among the "workers' aristocracy", i.e. highly qualified and well-paid specialists, out to become petty proprietors again, was thus a breeding ground for right-wing opportunism and revisionism.

As for "left" revisionism, which at that time was not yet sufficiently developed or defined, Lenin limited himself to pointing out its anarcho-syndicalist essence. Marx had already noted that the social basis for left anarchist trends in the working-class movement was the ("lumpen-proletariat",) i.e. declassé elements ready for any action, including the betrayal of their own class, for the sake of a fleeting advantage.

Lenin's "Marxism and Revisionism", and other articles close to it in content, notably "Differences in the European Working-Class Movement", disclosed the ideological essence of international revisionism and the tasks faced by the working-class movement in fighting this petty-bourgeois ideology.

Prominent among Lenin's work after the defeat of the 1905 revolution were his articles criticising bourgeois ideology. After the defeat of the revolution the Russian bourgeoisie took up a clearly counter-revolutionary stand. While before the revolution the bourgeois liberals were still flirting with revolution, between 1908 and 1910 their action basically coincided with that of the official tsarist ideologists. In 1909, a number of former "legal Marxists", together with outspoken apologists of capitalism, published the collection *Vekhi* (Landmarks), in which they overtly proclaimed their denunciation of the revolutionary struggle and even thanked tsarism "which alone, with its bayonets and jails, protects us [liberal bourgeoisie—*L.S.*] from the ire of the people".[116] In a number of his articles and especially in "On 'Landmarks'" Lenin gave an extensive assessment of the *Vekhi* ideology. He called *Vekhi* an "encyclopaedia of bourgeois apostasy", describing the content of the collection first as a struggle against the ideological foundations of the entire world view of Russian and international democracy, secondly, as a renunciation of the revolution by the bourgeoisie and its ideologists and, thirdly, as an open support for reaction, tsarism and the landowners. Lenin particularly stressed the struggle against materialist philosophy which was the cornerstone of the *Vek-*

hi people's ideas. They tried to smuggle in so-called "God-seeking" to replace materialism, i.e. they tried to preserve the influence of religion among the broad masses and thus keep them in passivity and obedience to tsarism.

It should be added that the "God-seeking" preached by the bourgeois ideologists among the workers at this time was closely linked to "God-building", a concept proclaimed by certain followers of Bogdanov. "God-builders" urged the setting up of a new religious cult among the workers, a cult that would replace their disillusionment with the revolution, caused by its defeat. It was a kind of opportunism showing the petty-bourgeois confusion and vacillation so typical of unstable sections of the petty-bourgeois intelligentsia.

Finally, an important direction in Lenin's ideological work in the period under review was his profound analysis of the development of Russian emancipatory thought, i.e. the ideology of the revolutionaries and utopian socialists. In his article "From the History of the Workers' Press in Russia", and especially in his series of articles about Leo Tolstoy, Lenin showed both the limitations and the general progressive nature of non-Marxist socialist thought in Russia for preparing the people for the revolutionary overthrow of tsarism.

Lenin showed that the main limitation of pre-Marxian socialism was its estrangement from the people, its inability to gain a foothold in the masses and the lack of a genuinely scientific world outlook, i.e. dialectical and historical materialism. At the same time, he stressed the great historical significance of the work done by Herzen and Chernyshevsky to philosophical materialism, and to the development of a revolutionary theory able to unite the masses. The Russian Social-Democratic movement, Lenin pointed out, was the legitimate heir to all that was advanced and progressive in the revolutionary social thought of the past.

In his articles about Leo Tolstoy, Lenin extensively analysed the great writer's work, at the same time criticising the essence of Tolstoy's socio-philosophical idea that one should not resist evil with violence, the theory he propounded in the latter period of his life. Lenin showed the deep-going contradictions in Tolstoy's work, his brilliant representation of the coming revolution in Russia and sharp criticism of the exploiter essence of autocracy and capitalism

on the one hand, and his calls for meekness and obedience to the violence of the propertied classes on the other.

Mention should also be made of Lenin's criticism of the vulgar historico-philosophical ideas advanced by the philosopher V. Shulyatikov, who aligned himself with the Bolsheviks at this time, but tried to substantiate a vulgar historical view of the history of social thought and philosophy. This is especially clear in his book where he asserted, for example, that the world in Descartes' philosophical system was "organised as a manufactory enterprise". Spinoza, in his view, was the "bard of the world bourgeoisie", and Leibniz's God was the "owner of an exemplary enterprise".[117] Hume's scepticism "was in line" with the notion of the "capitalist organism", and so on. In short, according to Shulyatikov the whole development of philosophical thought was merely a passive reflection of capitalist production. Having read his book Lenin wrote: "The entire book is an example of extreme vulgarisation of materialism. Instead of a concrete analysis of periods, formations, ideologies—*empty phrases* about 'organisers' and ridiculously strained, absurdly false comparisons.

"A caricature of materialism in *history*. And it is a pity, for there is an attempt made in the direction of materialism."[118]

Lenin's principles for criticising bourgeois philosophy and revisionism in the period being considered can be briefly summed up as a whole in the four points formulated in the conclusion to *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism*. Lenin said that Marxists should proceed to form a judgement of empirio-criticism from four main standpoints: (1) by comparing the theory of knowledge of a given school with that of dialectical materialism in all its main aspects; (2) by determining the historical place of a given conception in relation to the other trends of bourgeois philosophy; (3) by studying the connection between the given school and idealism in the field of special sciences; and, finally, (4) by analysing the party essence of the given conception.[119] These principles, as further ideological struggle against the opponents of Marxism has shown, are common to the analysis and criticism of any anti-Marxist school, whether it advocates an overt apology for idealism and metaphysics or revisionist theories disguised as "new" ones. Thus, a most important result of Lenin's work in the years

of reaction was also his study of the general approach to be taken by Marxism in the ideological struggle, and his demonstration of the methods and ways to be used to criticise bourgeois philosophy and revisionism.

The general significance of Lenin's philosophical activity during the reaction that set in after the defeat of the 1905-1907 revolution is exceptionally great and varied. Lenin continued his research into the philosophical foundations of Marxism and enriched it with an extensive and systematic exposition of dialectical materialism and its theory of reflection; he made an immense contribution to analysing the development of social thought and philosophy in the new historical conditions, when Russia's working class and its party were preparing for new revolutionary battles.

Lenin's theoretical work was very closely linked to his practical political leadership of revolutionary Bolshevik organisations. During severe political reaction, he prepared and, in 1912 conducted, the Sixth Prague Conference of the RSDLP, which finally banished the Mensheviks and other opportunists from the Party ranks. Also at this time Lenin made a prodigious effort to expose the Menshevik Liquidators and the so-called otzovists[120] from among Bogdanov's supporters, and then the opportunistic August Bloc,[121] which Trotsky tried to set up in opposition to Lenin's Bolshevik centre.

Lenin's philosophical activity was thus not only aimed at developing Marxist theory, but was the necessary link in further developing the Bolshevik Party, cleansing it of revisionism and opportunism and rallying around it the broad masses of the working people, headed by the proletariat, for new revolutionary battles against tsarism.

5. Philosophical Notebooks

The years 1910-1912 saw a new revolutionary upsurge in Russia. The shooting of workers in the Lena goldfields in 1912 and the stormy outcry of the proletariat showed that Russia was nearing a new revolution. From 1910 onwards, Lenin increasingly concentrated on how to bring about the proletarian revolution, and on the prospects for doing so, in the new historical conditions.

In December 1910, *Rabochaya gazeta* (Workers' Newspaper)—the Bolsheviks' illegal organ, issued in Paris—published Lenin's article "The Beginning of Demonstrations" which stated that in the summer of 1910 a new revolutionary upsurge had begun in Russia. "The Russian people," Lenin wrote, "are awakening to new struggle, advancing towards a new revolution." [122] Almost concurrently with this article, Lenin published his famous article "Certain Features of the Historical Development of Marxism" in the newspaper *Zvezda* (Star) which was legally circulated by the Bolsheviks in Petersburg since December 1910. The article was programmatic in Lenin's theoretical activity. It assessed the place and role of Marxist theory in preparing for a new revolution in Russia.

In the beginning, Lenin quotes Engels in saying that Marxist doctrine is not a dogma but a guide to action, and further on, analysing the destinies of the revolutionary movement, he shows that the chief, determining feature of Marxist theory is its connection with practice. Lenin stresses the indissoluble unity between the scientific conception of dialectics as a theory of development, and the practical tasks of the proletarian class. [123] He exposes the main flaw of all opportunistic theories, the way they are divorced from the practical tasks of the revolution, and thus their conversion into empty phraseology, which serves as a guise for renouncing the ultimate aims of the working-class movement. Lenin condemns these opportunistic distortions of Marxism and urges all genuinely revolutionary forces to unite on the ideological basis of Marxism, pointing out that this "is, in the most direct and precise meaning of the term, the task of the day for Marxists". [124]

The principal direction taken by Lenin's theoretical activity in this period was his further development of the revolutionary theory of Marxism as applied to the new tasks set by the historical situation in Russia. In all the speeches, articles and reports he made between 1910 and 1912 he dwelt on the indissoluble unity between the political struggle of the proletariat and the revolutionary theory of Marxism, and on Marxism as the theory guiding the revolutionary action of the workers, led by the Communists.

In 1912, Lenin wrote an article, published in *Sotsial-Demokrat,* the central organ of the RSDLP, to mark the centenary of the birth of Herzen, the great Russian think-

er and revolutionary. The article expounded a general Marxist view of the revolutionary democracy of the 1860s. What mainly characterised Herzen's philosophy, wrote Lenin, was its revolutionary spirit. Lenin credited the Decembrist revolutionaries,[125] who came from the nobility to brave death, with having awakened the younger generation—Herzen, Ogarev and their friends, who dedicated their entire lives to the revolutionary cause in Russia. The progressive nature of their political views was apparent in the fact that "Herzen came right up to dialectical materialism", having understood that dialectics is the "algebra of revolution".[126]

"In commemorating Herzen," Lenin wrote, "the proletariat is learning from his example to appreciate the great importance of revolutionary theory"[127]—the importance of theory being the effect it has of rousing the broad masses to struggle. While revolutionary noblemen were far from the people, and their successors, the revolutionaries of the 1860s were aware of the need for a link with the people but were unable to bring this about, the proletarian party, armed with the only scientific theory of Marxism, was capable of conducting a genuine people's revolution. At the end of his article Lenin noted: "The proletariat will fight its way to a free alliance with the socialist workers of all lands, having crushed that loathsome monster, the tsarist monarchy, against which Herzen was the first to raise the great banner of struggle by addressing his *free Russian word* to the masses."[128] The article has a special significance in Lenin's philosophical legacy. First, it showed the direct succession of the revolutionary tradition in Russia from the noblemen's revolutionary spirit of the early 19th century to the revolutionary-democrats and heroes of the Narodnaya Volya in the 1860s and 1870s, and from them to the workers' Social-Democratic movement of the late 19th century and to Bolshevism which arose under Lenin's leadership in the early 20th century. Secondly, it was the first scientific work to give a profound analysis and assessment of Russian materialist philosophy in the middle and latter half of the last century, in connection with the revolutionary movement against tsarism. Thirdly and finally, it forcefully emphasised a fundamental feature of the Marxist scientific outlook, namely its close unity with practice, with the popular movement. This is why it has for

more than half a century served as the methodological foundation for scientific research into the philosophy and social thought of the past.

In the spring of 1913, international Social-Democracy marked the thirtieth anniversary of the death of Karl Marx. Lenin responded to this event with two works: "The Historical Destiny of the Doctrine of Karl Marx", and "The Three Sources and Three Component Parts of Marxism", the former was published in the newspaper *Pravda,* founded by Lenin in 1912, the latter—in the legal Bolshevik journal *Prosveshcheniye* (Education).

In "The Historical Destiny of the Doctrine of Karl Marx" Lenin provided an overall assessment of Marxist theory. "The chief thing in the doctrine of Marx," he wrote, "is that it brings out the historic role of the proletariat as the builder of socialist society." [129]

The article also described the basic periods in the development of Marxist theory. The first period (1848-1871), that of social upheavals and revolutions, saw the birth of scientific socialism, the emergence of independent proletarian parties and the establishment of the first International Working Men's Association in history, the First International. The second period (1872-1904) was marked by a more or less peaceful development and an absence of revolutions. At this time, Marx's doctrine won a complete victory in the working-class movement, which intensified the struggle of the bourgeois ideologists and revisionists against Marxism. The revolution in Russia that began in 1904-1905 put an end to the so-called peaceful development of Marxism and turned it into a theory of oncoming world socialist revolution. We can see, then, that Lenin repeatedly stressed the unity of theory and practice as a major feature of Marx's teachings. While winning victories, the working-class movement faces ever more cunning attempts on the part of its opponents to undermine and weaken the influence of Marxism on the workers. "The dialectics of history were such," wrote Lenin, "that the theoretical victory of Marxism compelled its enemies to *disguise themselves* as Marxists." [130] Continuous, consistent efforts to purify Marxist theory are therefore indispensable to the life and progressive development of the proletarian parties in the 20th century.

"The Three Sources and Three Component Parts of Marx-

ism" contains an extensive evaluation of the ideological legacy of the founders of the proletarian world outlook. Lenin noted in it that Marxist teaching "emerged as the direct and immediate *continuation* of the teachings of the greatest representatives of philosophy, political economy and socialism",[131] representing the unity of these three component parts. The sources of Marxism, Lenin said, are German classical philosophy, English political economy, and French utopian socialism. Correspondingly, Marxist theory includes three components, the philosophy of dialectical and historical materialism, economic theory and scientific socialism.

In this work, Lenin provided a concise and profound analysis of Marxist philosophy which is based on philosophical materialism, single and integral. Most significantly, Marx did not just defend philosophical materialism, but enriched it with dialectics. And Lenin defined the theory of dialectics as the "doctrine of development in its fullest, deepest and most comprehensive form, the doctrine of the relativity of the human knowledge that provides us with a reflection of eternally developing matter."[132] This definition underlay all subsequent Marxist works on the theory of dialectics, serving as the philosophical and methodological basis for understanding the essence of dialectical materialist philosophy. Further, in ascertaining the essence of Marxist philosophy, Lenin showed that Marx extended his dialectical materialist conception of the world to society by creating historical materialism as the major aspect and indispensable component of the general philosophical conception of dialectical materialism. "Marx's philosophy," wrote Lenin, "is a consummate philosophical materialism which has provided mankind, and especially the working class, with powerful instruments of knowledge."[133]

At the same time, Lenin stressed that Marxist philosophy was not an abstract academic theory, but a militant guide to action.

The philosophy of dialectical materialism, Lenin said, can help Marxism "find, in the very society which surrounds us, the forces which can—and, owing to their social position, *must*—constitute the power capable of sweeping away the old and creating the new".[134] The essence of Marxist philosophy is thus manifested in the fact that it gives the proletariat and all oppressed working people a way out

of the spiritual enslavement to which they are doomed under the exploitation of man by man.

In September 1913, Marx and Engels' letters were published in Germany,[135] albeit very incomplete, with considerable abridgements, distortions and an inadequate reference system, as Lenin noted. Some sections of the *Correspondence* were edited and prefaced by Bernstein. "As might have been expected," Lenin wrote, "this work is unsatisfactory both from the technical and the ideological standpoint. After his notorious 'evolution' to extreme opportunist views, Bernstein should never have undertaken to edit letters which are impregnated through and through with the revolutionary spirit. Bernstein's prefaces are in part meaningless and in part simply false." [136]

Nevertheless, Lenin, who had been looking forward to this publication, thoroughly studied the letters. As early as November 1913, i.e. less than two months after their publication, he wrote to Maria Ulyanova: "I have just finished reading the four volumes of the Marx-Engels correspondence. I want to write about it in *Prosveshcheniye*. There is much of interest." [137]

In 1959, the Institute of Marxism-Leninism of the CPSU Central Committee published Lenin's conspectus of Marx and Engels' letters.[138] This unique document includes excerpts from Marx and Engels' correspondence and Lenin's notes and remarks. The main point of these excerpts was underlined in his review of the *Correspondence,* which he wrote right after finishing the book and which was published after the October Revolution in *Pravda*. "If one were to attempt to define in a single word the focus, so to speak, of the whole correspondence, the central point at which the whole body of ideas expressed and discussed converges—that word would be *dialectics.* The application of materialist dialectics to the reshaping of all political economy from its foundation up, its application to history, natural science, philosophy, and to the policy and tactics of the working class—that was what interested Marx and Engels most of all, that was where they contributed what was most essential and new, and that was what constituted the masterly advance they made in the history of revolutionary thought." [139]

He singles out all that concerns dialectics in Marx and Engels' letters, referring not just to theory per se, but

also to its direct relation to the policy, strategy and tactics of the proletarian party and to the revolutionary movement of the masses as a whole. Lenin's *Conspectus* is an ingenious elaboration of the vital problems of the revolutionary struggle in the 20th century, based on the experience and ideas of the founders of Marxism.

Lenin was keenly interested in the problems of materialist dialectics well before that. During the new revolutionary upsurge, when preparations were underway in Russia for a new proletarian revolution, he worked on the problems of dialectics as a necessary element of revolutionary work as a whole. The direct result of this was a series of theoretical works, published in 1913 and 1914, which elucidated the ideological foundations of the coming revolution from different angles and suggested solutions to both philosophical and concrete, political, strategic and tactical aspects of preparing and bringing about the revolution. Mention should be made among these works of a long article "On the Right of Nations to Self-Determination" (February-May 1914), the plan of an unwritten article "Revolution and War" (July 1914), which was the first to pose the problem of the proletarian struggle under imperialism, and finally an important article, "Karl Marx" (started in July 1914), which outlined the emergence and development of Marxism and gave an extensive description of philosophical materialism, the dialectical materialist concept of history, the theory of class struggle, and Marx's economic doctrine and theory of scientific socialism.

This theoretical work on the philosophical problems of Marxism was hindered by World War I, which was unleashed by the imperialists in July 1914. In the first days of the war the leaders of the Second International in different countries—Kautsky and Scheidemann in Germany, Vaillant, Vandervelde and Plekhanov in the Entente countries, and many others—betrayed the working-class cause and openly announced their support for the war, declaring it "just", and calling on the workers to take an active part in it and support their bourgeois governments.

Only Lenin and the Russian Bolshevik Party he led, as well as a few internationalists in Germany and Italy, opposed the war. In his work "The Collapse of the Second International" (May-June 1915) Lenin bitterly criticised this betrayal, showing that ideologically it meant abandon-

ing revolutionary Marxism and taking up the position of social-chauvinism and complete renunciation of revolutionary materialist dialectics.

Assessing the stand taken by the leaders of the Second International on the imperialist-unleashed war, Lenin wrote: "Instead of revolutionary tactics, most of the Social-Democratic parties launched reactionary tactics, and went over to the side of their respective governments and bourgeoisie. This betrayal of socialism signifies the collapse of the Second (1899-1914) International." [140] Theoretically, this betrayal meant that the social-chauvinists [141] went over to a position of subjectivism and anti-dialectics. Lenin described this position as sophistry and eclecticism, i.e. an arbitrary pinpointing and picking out of phenomena which resemble one another only superficially, without analysing them concretely, and a mechanical combining of heterogeneous, disconnected elements. This served as the basis for the social-chauvinist theory of "the one who started it", which maintained that the countries which had first begun armed hostilities were wrong. Hence the social-chauvinist leaders averred that the German imperialists, who were the first to begin the war, were on the wrong side, while the French, Russian and British imperialists were justified in their actions. Clearly, such an interpretation was a clean break with the concrete, dialectical analysis of the causes and essence of war and, correspondingly, with determining the proletariat's strategy and tactics in the existing conditions.

It was vital to defend the theory of materialist dialectics on all fronts from this social-chauvinistic travesty, and to creatively use it for developing the foundations of a revolutionary programme for the proletarian parties in the new historical conditions. Lenin fulfilled this task in his *Philosophical Notebooks* and in the other works written during the imperialist war.

In the *Philosophical Notebooks* Lenin provided a general description of dialectics as a philosophical science, defining it as the unity of the theory of the development of the material world and the cognition, assessment and revolutionary transformation of reality by man. This set the single philosophical and methodological basis on which Lenin subsequently developed the general theory of imperialism, the new theory of socialist revolution, and formu-

lated his major philosophical ideas on the laws of social development in the epoch of imperialism and proletarian revolutions and on the state and human culture and the laws governing its development.

In the *Philosophical Notebooks* one can identify three crucial aspects in analysing the problems of materialist dialectics: (1) demonstrating the essence of dialectics as the theory of the development of the material world, taken in its most general form; (2) analysing the unity of dialectics, the theory of knowledge and the logic of Marxism; and (3) substantiating the significance of materialist dialectics as the theoretical basis for people's practical, transforming activity. These problems, as they are considered in the *Philosophical Notebooks*, in fact form a most integral and comprehensive exposition of the fundamentals of the general theory of the Marxist dialectics, based on a general overview of the achievements of science and practice in the early 20th century. In this respect Lenin's *Philosophical Notebooks* are a most important Marxist-Leninist work, equal in its significance to Marx's *Capital* and Engels' *Anti-Dühring* and *Dialectics of Nature*. At the same time, the *Philosophical Notebooks* are the theoretical basis for Lenin's socio-theoretical and revolutionary practical activity in the years immediately preceding the Great October Socialist Revolution.

Describing the essence of materialist dialectics, Lenin showed that the doctrine of the unity and struggle of opposites is at its core. He wrote: "In brief, dialectics can be defined as the doctrine of the unity of opposites. This embodies the essence of dialectics, but it requires explanations and development." [142] This position was elaborated on in the *Notebooks* in considerable detail.

Mention should first of all be made of the basic elements of dialectics which Lenin formulated in developing his tenet of the nucleus, the core of dialectics. His sixteen elements are conventionally reduced to three main groups. The first is made up of elements that reveal the objective dialectics of the internal self-movement of matter: the development of objects and phenomena, the presence in them of internally contradictory tendencies and aspects, their struggle which appears as the source of self-development of every given thing, every process and phenomenon, and finally a description of all phenomena as the sum total and unity

Infinite = without beginning or end.

of opposites. The second group shows the dialectic of interaction between things and phenomena, which includes such basic indicators as generality, the universality of relations between each separate thing or phenomenon and each other, the infinite process of demonstrating such contradictions, and the universality of their connections, mutual transitions, and quantitative and qualitative changes. Finally, the third group concerns so-called subjective dialectics, i.e. processes whereby the material world is reflected in human consciousness. Here Lenin showed the unity between the laws of the objective world and its cognition by man, the eternal nature of cognition, and the extent of its levels, ranging from the identification of simple forms of ties (coexistence, etc.) to causality and other essential interactions. [143]

Further Lenin specified the essence of dialectical laws and their seniority in the entire system of dialectical theory. He showed the leading role of the law of the unity and struggle of opposites, which reveals the source of the internal self-movement and self-development of objects and phenomena of the material world. In "On the Question of Dialectics", which sums up, as it were, the whole of Lenin's research into the relevant problems, Lenin writes: "The unity (coincidence, identity, equal action) of opposites is conditional, temporary, transitory, relative. The struggle of mutually exclusive opposites is absolute, just as development and motion are absolute." [144]

While treating the laws of the transition of quantity into quality and of the negation of negation in this work, Lenin formulated several basic propositions, which enriched Marx and Engels' teaching on dialectics. Of special importance is his definition of dialectical leap (the operation of the law of the transition of quantity into quality): "What distinguishes the dialectical transition from the undialectical transition? The leap. The contradiction. The interruption of gradualness. The unity (identity) of Being and not-Being." [145] This postulate includes several important points. First, Lenin underlines that a dialectical leap is characterised by the unity of the interruption of gradualness and the internal contradiction, meaning that the operation of this law is directly linked with the operation of the law of the unity and struggle of opposites. Second, the definition contains a postulate of the unity of Being and not-

Being in a qualitative leap. This is essentially the general theoretical foundation for the Marxist interpretation of the coexistence of the old and the new during a dialectical leap. Hence the leap is not an instantaneous discarding (or forcible elimination) of the old, but a certain interval, during which the old coexists with the new in a definite mutual relationship. Some time later, in his article "On the Slogan for a United States of Europe" (1915), Lenin drew his famous conclusion on the possibility of socialism triumphing first in one country, and defined a general strategic line to be taken by world socialism during the transition from capitalism to communism, as a policy of peaceful economic competition between the two systems and of the peaceful coexistence of countries with different social and political systems.

Three main components are pointed out by Lenin in his *Philosophical Notebooks* as he deals with the law of negation of the negation—successiveness, the onward nature of all development, and its spiral-like character. Lenin reveals the essence of this law, the way dialectical ties between the old and the new are manifested in it as it operates, the way the progressive features of the old are used at new levels of development, and the unity in time of all the lines and directions of the dialectical process.

While examining dialectical categories, Lenin formulated a number of important ideas, his definition of category being particularly important. Categories, he says, are "stages of distinguishing, i.e., of cognising the world, focal points in the web, which assist in cognising and mastering it." [146] Categories in the theory of dialectics, he goes on to say, are important because they help man to cognise and assess the operation of the objective laws governing the world; they are "an expression of laws both of nature and of man". [147]

Lenin repeatedly stressed that categories are moments in man's knowledge of the objective world, whose importance in the process of cognition consists in that they help man to formulate the general laws of the evolution of nature, society and human knowledge.

Lenin examined four main aspects of categories: the first is the ontological aspect—categories are seen as the reflection in man's consciousness of the objective and more general features of the material world. The second aspect may

be called epistemological—categories help the human mind to reflect and generalise the most common features of the objective world, thus creating a truly scientific system of concepts about external reality and using it to cognise, interpret and transform the world. The ontological and epistemological aspects of the Marxist teaching on categories are closely interconnected, for the laws of the material world and its cognition by man are as indivisible as dialectics itself is.

The third aspect of the Marxist teaching on categories may be described as methodological. Thinking always implies categories; such is its nature. Man always thinks in certain categories, irrespective of his will or intention. Therefore, knowledge of the more general categories of dialectics renders thought more fruitful and makes it correspond in greater measure to the real facts it reflects in the form of concepts.

The fourth and last aspect of categories is related to world outlook. Thinking in categories is not only a reflection, but also an assessment of reality, a singling out in this reality of what is most valuable for man. Knowing dialectical categories, therefore, helps create a harmonious and true picture of the world in man's consciousness, that is, a scientific world outlook.

Dialectics as a general theory of development distinguishes three sub-systems in its system of categories. The first, which determines the other two, is a group of categories reflecting real, objective aspects of reality as it develops, and these exist independently of man's consciousness. These categories reveal the systems nature of the world, the sources of its internal development and its specific features, and the relations between developing systems. The second sub-system of dialectical categories, which stems from the first, characterises subjective dialectics as a theory of knowledge and includes categories characterising the dialectics of the reflection in man's consciousness of the objective world, the informative essence of reflection and the dialectics of the types, forms and stages of knowledge. The third sub-system of categories is also subjective dialectics, but it is related to the logic of theoretical thought, embracing general concepts which determine the essence of dialectical cognition and describe its evolution and the distinguishing features of logical operations and methods of

dialectical thinking. This sub-system is a derivative of the first and the second sub-systems.

The above three sub-systems comprise the general system of categories of materialist dialectics, both objective—the theory of the evolution of the material world, and subjective (the theory of knowledge and logic in their indissoluble unity). This unity is determined by the fact that the objective dialectics of the material world, reflected in consciousness, appears as the theory of evolution, while the subjective dialectics of the reflection of the world in consciousness appears as the theory and logic of theoretical thinking.

Marx, Engels and Lenin did not set themselves the task of creating, once and for all, a complete system of philosophical categories. Marxism-Leninism, on the contrary, considers the problem of the system of categories as a process of eternally expanding man's knowledge of the external world and human thought. A number of notions, which formerly had the character of categories, are given a new, more profound content. On the other hand, the evolution of knowledge had caused a number of new concepts to arise, which have today obtained the significance of categories.

One of the main directions in the theory of materialist dialectics in the *Philosophical Notebooks* is the clarification it gives of the dialectics of human knowledge and the theoretical logic of thinking. Lenin characterised the dialectical method revealed by Marx as follows: "In *Capital,* Marx applied to a single science logic, dialectics and the theory of knowledge of materialism [three words are not needed: it is one and the same thing] which has taken everything valuable in Hegel and developed it further." [148]

Lenin gave this method a concrete form applying it to concepts and major figures in logic, to the stages of cognition and the role of practice in knowledge and, finally, to the entire content of the dialectics of human knowledge of the material world. "Dialectics," he wrote, "*is* the theory of knowledge of (Hegel and) Marxism." [149] And it is dialectics which shows that "human knowledge is not (or does not follow) a straight line, but a curve, which endlessly approximates a series of circles, a spiral". [150]

Lenin exposes the essence of this process by analysing the major forms taken by the reflection of the world in man's consciousness. The dialectics of sensations, percepti-

Concepts or ideas or thoughts

ons, notions and concepts appears as a dialectical process of movement from ignorance to knowledge, as a dialectical transition from knowledge of phenomena to cognising their essence, from essence of the first order to essence of the second order, *ad infinitum.*

The process of cognition, Lenin wrote, is not a smooth evolution: "The movement of cognition *to* the object can always only proceed dialectically." [151] This means that a "scientific consideration demands the demonstration of difference, connection, transition. Without that, the simple positive assertion is incomplete, lifeless, dead ... the 'dialectical moment' demands the demonstration of '*unity*', i.e., of the connection of negative and positive, the presence of this positive in the negative". [152] It follows, then, that the process of cognition is infinite in the same way as the quantity and variety of ties and transitions. The data of sensual knowledge appear in the form of words, i.e. in the final count, concepts.

Is the concept "sensual knowledge" equivalent to the concept "living perception"? Obviously not. The sensual and the rational are aspects of reflection of the objective world in consciousness—direct (sensations, etc.) and indirect (concepts) reflection. Living perception is characterised by Lenin quite clearly: "First of all impressions *flash by,* then *something* emerges,—afterwards the concepts of *quality* (the determination of the thing or the phenomenon) and *quantity* are developed." [153] Consequently, the process of living perception includes not only direct sensual knowledge (impressions) but also certain abstractions (something, quality, the determination of a thing and quantity), concepts. Lenin emphasised the unity of living perception and people's practical activity. The process of cognition is the forming of logical concepts; but it is on the basis of practical activity that these concepts appear at the first stage of cognition.

Lenin pointed out that the "most simple, ordinary, mass, immediate 'Being' " [154] is the direct result of knowledge at its first stage. Such an abstraction is a necessary link in the process of cognition, a stage which is indispensable in cognising the concrete.

Marx describes this process in his Introduction to *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy.* In the course of living perception, from a "very vague notion of a

complex whole . . . one would arrive analytically at increasingly simple concepts; from imaginary concrete terms one would move to more and more tenuous abstractions until one reached the most simple definitions". This path is characterised by Marx as singling out, through analysis, certain abstract relations. This in turn serves as the basis for proceeding from immediate notion to abstract definition. Such "abstract, general relations" are the initial material for a higher, second stage of cognition.[155]

Dialectical thinking provides a genuinely scientific concept of the continuity of the objective world as it develops, which may be defined as an abstraction of the second order. Essentially, it is an ascent from abstractions of the first order to reproduction of the concrete in cognition, i.e. revealing the objective dialectic of the material world in the subjective dialectics of human thought. Discrete information produced by sensual knowledge, at the stage of living perception, serves as the material, or "cells", of cognition, out of which dialectical thinking builds knowledge about the universal and continuous chain of development of the entire objective world in the infinite variety of its structural elements, connections and laws.

Lenin considered the second stage of cognition by investigating changes in the development of the objective world from distinction to contradiction, from one contradiction to another, etc. This evidently is the essence of the second stage of cognition—scientific abstraction. He comprehensively describes this process: "After that, study and reflection direct thought to cognition of identity—of difference—of Ground—of the Essence versus the phenomenon—of causality, etc."[156]

These general theoretical propositions are given concrete expression in Lenin's other works, most clearly in his *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism.*

Marx described the process of scientific abstraction as proceeding from the abstract to the concrete. The investigation of this process is, in all probability, the task of dialectical logic, as distinct from elementary or formal logic, which probes into the more simple processes of thinking, in particular those that occur at the stage of living perception. While noting that the "unfolding of the sum-total of the moments of actuality NB = the essence of dialectical cognition",[157] Lenin emphasised that it is the second stage

of cognition that is the sphere of action of dialectical logic.

Speaking of the logic of theoretical thinking, Lenin formulated his tenet that dialectics is the logic of Marxism, for, in contrast to formal logic, dialectical logic "is the science not of external forms of thought but of the laws of development, 'of all material, natural and spiritual things', i.e., of the development of the entire concrete content of the world and of its cognition, i.e., the sum-total, the conclusion of the *History* of knowledge of the world".[158] Lenin shows at the same time that studying only the forms of thought, divorced from their content, will not help comprehend truth and that therefore absolutising the tenets of formal logic, which no doubt have their own, specific sphere of application, leads to errors and sophistry.

Lenin's words that "in *Capital* Marx applied to a single science logic, dialectics and the theory of knowledge of materialism [three words are not needed: it is one and the same thing]"[159] imply that human consciousness fully reflects the objective dialectics of the material world. Hence dialectical laws are simultaneously the laws of the objective world and of its reflection in human consciousness (the theory of knowledge) and theoretical thought (logic).

This unity is manifested in the dialectics of concepts. "Finite? That means *moving* to an end! Something?—means *not that* which is Other. Being in general?—means such indeterminateness that Being = not-Being. All-sided, universal flexibility of concepts, a flexibility reaching to the identity of opposites,—that is the essence of the matter. This flexibility, applied subjectively = eclecticism and sophistry. Flexibility, applied *objectively,* i.e., reflecting the all-sidedness of the material process and its unity, is dialectics, is the correct reflection of the eternal development of the world."[160]

And, finally, in Lenin's general description of human knowledge, his vital conclusion that the unity of knowledge and practice is the essence of dialectical cognition should be specially emphasised: "Thought proceeding from the concrete to the abstract—provided it is *correct* . . does not get away *from* the truth but comes closer to it.... From living perception to abstract thought, *and from this to practice,*—such is the dialectical path of the cognition of *truth,* of the cognition of objective reality."[161] This is

essentially the basis for understanding the dialectical nature of cognition, Marxist epistemology and dialectical logic. Lenin underlines that forms of the reflection of the objective world in man's consciousness are not kinds of envelopes inherent in consciousness alone, but an actual reflection of the objective world in man's consciousness. Of particular importance is the fact that Lenin discloses the unity of cognition and the material world through practice, describing this as the process of man's interaction with the material world: "THE PRACTICAL ACTIVITY OF MAN HAD TO LEAD HIS CONSCIOUSNESS TO THE REPETITION OF VARIOUS LOGICAL FIGURES THOUSANDS OF MILLIONS OF TIMES *IN ORDER THAT* THESE FIGURES *COULD* OBTAIN THE SIGNIFICANCE OF *AXIOMS*. THIS NOTA BENE." [162] Lenin's final conclusion was as follows: "Man by his *practice* proves the objective correctness of his ideas, concepts, knowledge, science." [163] Man needs these concepts, knowledge and science precisely for practice, for the creative and purposeful transformation of the external world and himself in accordance with his innermost needs and requirements.

Now we are approaching yet another set of ideas creatively developed by Lenin in his *Philosophical Notebooks*. They pertain to dialectics as the theory of people's revolutionary-transforming activity. Lenin said: "Man's consciousness not only reflects the objective world, but creates it ... i.e., the world does not satisfy man and man decides to change it by his activity." [164] From this angle practice in the theory of dialectics is not only a category of epistemology, a criterion of truth, etc., but also a major category of dialectics, as the theory of man's practical activities. Lenin points out several crucial aspects of this problem, such as the dialectics of the object and the subject of action, of action and its goal, action and its result, action and its assessment, and finally, action as the basis for perceiving new tasks in man's theoretical and practical activities.

One exceptionally important point should be specially stressed in Lenin's definition of practice: "Practice is higher than (theoretical) knowledge, for it has not only the dignity of iniversality, but also of immediate actuality." [165] Practice, according to Lenin, includes: (1) a subjective end; (2) external means (man's instruments); (3) the coincidence of the subjective and the objective. [166] Hence "the

activity of man, who has constructed an objective picture of the world for himself, *changes* external actuality".[167] The concept of subjectivity is defined as follows: "Subjectivity is the *impulse* to destroy ... separation (of the idea from the object)"[168], meaning that the subjective, as the content of man's cognition of the world, appears to be independent of this world: "In actual fact, men's ends are engendered by the objective world and presuppose it,—they find it as something given, present. But it *seems* to man as if his ends are taken from outside the world and are independent of the world."[169] Yet human activity as well as cognition, is based on the objective laws governing the material world.[170] Hence the result of this activity "is the test of subjective cognition and the criterion of OBJECTIVITY WHICH TRULY IS."[171] Failures in practice, in achieving the goals of man's activity, Lenin says, are rooted in a lack of knowledge of objective reality and in not taking account of its laws.[172] And vice versa, knowledge of the world's genuine laws and the conscientious application of them in practical activities lead to the achievement of goals men have set themselves.

Very important are Lenin's ideas on the place and role of evaluative approaches, of value judgements in cognition, in people's practical activities. First of all, we should emphasise his idea that an evaluative approach is present as an indispensable component of the entire range of human knowledge, i.e. both at the stage of living perception and at the stage of abstract thought. In practical activities this approach acquires special significance. As Lenin says, "the 'good' is a 'demand of external actuality', i.e., by the 'good' is understood man's *practice*=the demand (1) also of *external* actuality (2)".[173] It follows that the "good", the "benefit" and other evaluative concepts are nothing else but manifestations of man's relation to the world he is cognising and transforming. Since the goals of cognition and transformation embody people's needs, corresponding to the objective laws of their development, the evaluative approach is an indispensable component of the general process of cognising the world. And vice versa: if the goals and actions contradict the objective laws, science-based cognition opposes such goals and actions. This occurs, for example, when the apologists of the moribund exploiter relations try to substantiate and justify their class actions.

Elucidation = to make clear, explain.

Such an approach is anti-scientific and anti-humane for it is spearheaded against the interests and needs of the majority, i.e., of the working people.

Assessing the prognostic role of scientific knowledge, Lenin writes: "The concept (cognition) reveals the essence (the law of causality, identity, difference, etc.) in Being (in immediate phenomena)—such is actually the *general course* of all human cognition (of all science) in general." [174] But this course of cognition is mediated and substantiated by practice. Lenin emphasises: "Testing by facts or by practice respectively, is to be found . . . in *each* step of the analysis," [175] that is, practice is not just the realisation of people's goals, the test and substantiation of their ideas, but also an elucidation and means of perceiving ever new tasks confronting the cognising subject.

The *Philosophical Notebooks* abound in ideas related to many other philosophical problems. Specifically, they criticise idealism and metaphysics, assess from Marxist positions the worldwide development of philosophical thought, and evaluate various schools and trends in philosophy. This makes the book a major classical work of Marxist philosophy, whose significance steadily increases as the tasks facing Marxist-Leninist thought become more and more complicated.

The ideas set forth in the *Philosophical Notebooks* helped Lenin to substantiate theoretically many concrete issues in the proletarian revolutionary struggle against capitalism. Of special significance are his socio-philosophical ideas on the place and role of imperialism in the history of bourgeois society, as well as on the strategy and tactics of the socialist revolution, and on social, scientific and technical progress in the first decades of the 20th century.

6. The Age of Imperialism and Socialist Revolutions

In his works of the World War I period Lenin comprehensively analysed the dialectics of social development in the early 20th century. This period was noted for many qualitatively new phenomena and processes, which proved that humankind entered a new stage of its development,

Patriarch = Noble, aristocrats,

characterised by several novel features. The socio-philosophical literature of these years discussed the essence of this new period at length. Marxist philosophical and social thought, therefore, was faced with the task of investigating the peculiarities of the operation of the laws of social revolution in the new historical conditions, the strategy and tactics of the international working-class movement, the specific development of various areas and regions in human society as a whole and the essence of social shifts inherent in it at the beginning of the century. All these problems were reflected in Lenin's socio-political and philosophical speeches and works of that period.

Of primary importance was his examination of the new historical era which set in at the turn of the 20th century. He characterised its essence as *imperialism*. Late in the 19th century, when he began his theoretical work, Lenin pointed out that that period was marked by "the rapid transformation of the methods of production and the enormous concentration of production, the disappearance of all forms of personal dependence and patriarchalism in relationships, the mobility of the population, the influence of the big industrial centres, etc." [176] Between 1912 and 1914, Lenin repeatedly pointed out that a new chapter was begun in the history of society, the content of which was a special stage of capitalist development, [177] which he called imperialism.

Lenin provided a far-reaching, comprehensive analysis of the concept of imperialism and sharply criticised bourgeois and opportunistic interpretations of it. Kautsky, for example, regarded imperialism as the policy of certain classes or even the personal activity of certain rulers. He showed that the concept of imperialism had emerged historically long before the capitalist era to denote the urge of certain states for territorial expansion and annexation. By the beginning of the 20th century, however, the term acquired a new social and economic meaning. Lenin wrote: "Colonial policy and imperialism existed before the latest stage of capitalism, and even before capitalism. Rome, founded on slavery, pursued a colonial policy and practised imperialism." [178] Yet these facts did not provide any grounds for justifying the attempts of bourgeois historians and opportunist theoreticians from the Second International to speak of the features of imperialism in general terms, without

assessing the specific socio-economic system. Such attempts "inevitably turn into the most vapid banality or bragging".[179] To illustrate the emptiness and unscientific nature of such attempts, Lenin cited C. P. Lucas' *Greater Rome and Greater Britain* (Oxford, 1912) and E. B. Cromer's *Ancient and Modern Imperialism* (London, 1910). He described these books as presumptuous nationalistic prattle, aimed at justifying and extolling British colonialism. Lenin also sharply criticised Kautsky's theory of imperialism as a special type of policy pursued by certain capitalist powers. Such an interpretation of imperialism led Kautsky to his theory of "ultra-imperialism"—a special "peaceful" phase, allegedly the outcome of capitalist development in the 20th century. According to Kautsky, a peaceful period of capitalism growing over into socialism, without the class struggle and a revolutionary explosion, must be substituted for the drive for annexations inherent in the policies of the imperialist powers at the beginning of the 20th century, by way of concentrating power and economic might in the hands of a single all-world monopoly. Lenin assessed this theory as a "one-sided and monstrously distorted approach to the subject"[180] and a substitution of eclecticism and sophistry for Marx's revolutionary dialectics.[181] Kautskian theoretical foundations, he wrote, "are permeated *through and through* with a spirit, absolutely irreconcilable with Marxism, of obscuring and glossing over the fundamental contradictions of imperialism".[182] In saying this, Lenin emphasised that the methodological principles common to the bourgeois and opportunist interpretation of the new stage in the development of capitalism amounted to a complete renunciation and open rejection of Marx's materialist dialectics.

Lenin countered these unscientific ideas with an objective analysis of the true laws of capitalist development at the modern stage. Contemporary capitalism, he wrote, is characterised by "the enormous growth of industry and the remarkably rapid concentration of production in ever-larger enterprises".[183] This process of the socialisation of production, despite the monopoly will, brings society to the threshold of a new social order, for it prepares the requisite material and technical conditions. The basic contradictions of capitalism—those between labour and capital, and between the social nature of production and the

private mode of appropriating the material wealth—sharpen to the extreme. "The yoke of a few monopolists on the rest of the population becomes a hundred times heavier, more burdensome and intolerable," [184] Lenin wrote. All this shows that imperialism is a special stage of capitalist development—the highest and the last—during which the material and technical conditions are fully prepared for a forthcoming socialist revolution and all the requisites for its victory are created.

After examining the principal features of imperialism, Lenin came to the conclusion that the most important among them was the merger of industrial and banking capital, resulting in a new type, financial capital. At the pre-monopoly stage, the reactionary, conservative aspect of the contradiction between labour and capital was personified by the owners of the means of production—real life capitalists.

Now, under imperialism, capital assumes an ever more impersonal, anonymous character, making its dominance more despotic and more inhuman. Man's alienation continues to intensify, not just in the sphere of economics, politics and morals, but also in the sphere of production management, where the actual owners of capital are formally separated from the banks which dispose of this capital and which become the real masters of all social life.

This results, on the one hand, in a sharp increase in the political reaction of the ruling classes, and, on the other, in an increase in revolutionary attitudes among the oppressed masses, especially in the countries economically and politically dependent on the imperialist powers. In the imperialist states, two trends are discernible in the working-class social development. On the one hand, political oppression and resistance put up by the most deprived sections of society undoubtedly increase; on the other, the imperialist bourgeoisie uses its superprofits, received through exploiting the oppressed countries and peoples, to bribe the upper crust of the working class at home, thus turning it into a "working-class aristocracy", opposed to the grass-root proletarians. This working-class aristocracy nominate leaders from among themselves for the working-class movement—"working-class bureaucrats" who are in fact hired agents of imperialism. Lenin cites the case of Millerand, a former working-class leader and member of

the French Socialist Party, who turned into a servile henchman of his country's imperialists. A similar degeneration underwent many labour leaders in Britain, Germany, the USA, Russia and other imperialist countries.

The next principal feature of imperialism, Lenin says, is an increasingly intensive substitution of the export of capital for the export of goods. Monopolies try to spread their domination over the globe, seeking whatever opportunity to invest their capital in the economy of other countries, especially in less developed or dependent on the imperialist mother-countries. This clearly indicates that at the stage of imperialism, capitalism turns into a parasitic, decaying social system. After examining many instances of capital investment by imperialists from Britain, the USA and other developed capitalist countries, Lenin proved that they were turning more and more from producer states into investor states or rentiers, which derive most of their profits not from their own production, but from money-lending.

The economic oppression and plunder of the peoples of the underdeveloped countries and colonies inadvertently leads to a sharp exacerbation in the contradictions between mother-countries and colonies. Three important consequences ensue: first, the export of capital to the underdeveloped countries "influences and greatly accelerates the development of capitalism" [185] in those countries. Second, the development of capitalism facilitates the political and social self-awareness of the oppressed nations in these countries, while the proletariat and its vanguard—the political working-class parties, which set themselves the goal of abolishing the power of capital both in their own country and throughout the world—develop and are consolidated. And third, the isolated national liberation movements of the oppressed peoples fuse into a world anti-imperialist movement, which becomes an ally and reserve of the international working-class movement against capitalism.

Lenin singled out and systematised a group of features characterising imperialism and revealing an irreconcilable contradiction within the class of the imperialist bourgeoisie—the contradiction between monopoly groups and imperialist states. Thus, under imperialism, the uncontrolled sway of major monopolies and states, torn apart by rival-

ry, is substituted for bourgeois competition. By the end of the 19th century, all the colonies and spheres of economic domination had been divided up among these monopolies and states and a struggle to recarve these spheres in economic and political terms had begun. Countries that ran ahead of their neighbours in economic development and colonial conquests, such as Britain, France, Belgium and the Netherlands, strove to retain their dominant positions in the world, while "deprived" states, including Germany and Japan, strove to make up for the "losses incurred" and to seize raw material resources, markets and investment opportunities from their better-off partners. By the beginning of the 20th century, two imperialist alliances had emerged which exerted every effort to weaken each other economically and politically. They were, on the one hand, the Entente powers [186] (Britain, France and Russia, later joined by Italy, the USA, Japan and several other states in Europe, America and Asia) and, on the other, the so-called Central Powers—Germany, Austria-Hungary, and later Turkey and Bulgaria.

Lenin studied these contradictions and showed that they inevitably led imperialism away from economic struggle to the most acute forms of political struggle, i.e. to wars which are unjust and annexationist on both sides. He defined these as imperialist wars and proved that the first war of this type was the war for the possession of Cuba that broke out in 1898 between the USA and Spain and resulted in turning Spain's colony into a fictitiously independent state which was in actual fact subordinated to the USA economically and politically. Another example was the war between Russia and Japan in 1904-1905, which resulted in the Russian and Japanese imperialist states partially redividing their spheres of influence in China and Korea to Japan's advantage. In 1914 a war broke out between Germany and Austria-Hungary on the one hand, and France, Russia and Britain on the other; it soon grew into a world war involving many countries and peoples.

From specific analysis of the development of capitalism in the 20th century, Lenin came to the irrefutable conclusion that capitalism increasingly acquires the characteristics of a parasitic, decaying social system. For such capitalism, Lenin notes, "there are no other means of restoring the periodically disturbed equilibrium than crises

Moribund = dying; coming to an end.

in industry and wars in politics".[187] Hence he concludes that "uneven economic and political development is an absolute law of capitalism".[188]

Most significantly, characterising imperialism as decaying capitalism, Lenin does not mention any slowdown in the development of the productive forces. On the contrary, he stresses that "it would be a mistake to believe that this tendency to decay precludes the rapid growth of capitalism . . . On the whole, capitalism is growing far more rapidly than before; but this growth is not only becoming more and more uneven in general, its unevenness also manifests itself, in particular, in the decay of the countries which are richest in capital."[189] The above brings Lenin to a general assessment of society's development at the stage of imperialism: "We must define it as capitalism in transition, or, more precisely, as moribund capitalism."[190] The downfall of capitalism signifies nothing else but the victory of the proletarian revolution, the beginning of the world historical transition of human society from capitalism to socialism.

In the 19th century, Marx came to the conclusion, based on the experience of pre-monopoly capitalism, that the victory of the socialist revolution was only possible in all countries simultaneously or, at least, in a group of the largest economically advanced countries. Under imperialism the situation radically changes. Lenin developed and gave concrete expression to the theory of socialist revolution which Marx created, and revealed that uneven capitalist development at the stage of imperialism weakens the latter's domination over the world to such a degree that it becomes possible to break the chain of imperialism first in one, isolated link. This implies that the proletarian revolution could triumph and socialism could be built in one, isolated country.

In his article "On the Slogan for a United States of Europe" (1915) Lenin pointed out: "The victory of socialism is possible first in several or even in one capitalist country alone. After expropriating the capitalists and organising their own socialist production, the victorious proletariat of that country will arise *against* the rest of the world—the capitalist world—attracting to its cause the oppressed classes of other countries."[191] A year later, in his article "The Military Programme of the Proletarian

Revolution", Lenin rendered his proposition more specific, saying that, under imperialist conditions, "socialism cannot achieve victory simultaneously *in all* countries. It will achieve victory first in one or several countries, while the others will, for some time remain bourgeois or pre-bourgeois".[192] Here Lenin advanced his idea of the possibility and necessity for countries with different social and political systems to coexist, which subsequently became the basis for the entire world strategy pursued by the Soviet Union in its relations with the capitalist states.

This was a new theory of socialist revolution, a creative development of Marx and Engels's idea on the essence of the revolutionary transition from capitalism to socialism. In 1914, in *The Collapse of the Second International,* which is known as Lenin's teaching on the revolutionary situation, Lenin provided a detailed analysis of the historical conditions on the eve of the proletarian revolutions. He formulated the following objective conditions for a revolutionary situation: (1) a crisis within the "upper classes", i.e. when it becomes impossible for the ruling classes to maintain their rule without any change; (2) a sharp growth in the poverty and privations of the oppressed classes; (3) as a consequence, a considerable increase in the social activity of the masses. For these conditions to begin to operate, Lenin said, a subjective condition was indispensable: the ability of the revolutionary class to take revolutionary mass action.[193]

To sum up: Lenin's discovery of the law of the uneven economic and political development of capitalism at the stage of imperialism, his conclusion that it was possible (1915) and necessary (1916) for the revolution to triumph first in one country and, finally, his definition of the objective and subjective conditions making up a revolutionary situation, were the components of the new theory of socialist revolution he created. Interestingly, in 1915, when speaking on the form of state power to emerge after a victorious proletarian revolution, Lenin pointed out: "The political form of a society wherein the proletariat is victorious in overthrowing the bourgeoisie will be a democratic republic."[194] Thus, even prior to the February revolution in Russia and to his famous "The Tasks of the Proletariat in the Present Revolution", in which he proved that the establishment of state power in revolution-

ary Russia in the form of Soviets was law-governed and expedient, Lenin acknowledged the possibility of setting up a dictatorship of the proletariat in the form of a democratic (i.e. parliamentary) republic. It was then that he laid down the groundwork for conclusions about the possibility of different forms of the dictatorship of the proletariat (let us recall that Soviets first appeared during the 1905 revolution, while the dictatorship of the proletariat emerged much earlier, in the form of state power, as embodied in the Paris Commune of 1871).

The strategy and tactics of the socialist revolution occupy an important place in Lenin's analysis of the social problems of Marxist philosophy. As distinct from the abstract speculations of the opportunists in the Second International, Lenin elaborated his theory of revolution in concrete terms. Its entire content and ideological thrust are spearheaded at tackling the practical issues of the socialist revolution. This explains his vested interest in the strategy and tactics of the proletarian movement at that time.

Lenin saw the essence of proletarian strategy as tied up with the principal line of the revolution, characterising it, with regard to the tasks facing the Bolshevik Party on the eve of the October Revolution, as a "supremely courageous revolutionary struggle against the monarchy ... a struggle that will sweep along in its wake all the democratic masses, i.e., mainly the peasantry".[195] Thus strategy, according to Lenin, determines the direction of the main blow of which the major forces of the proletariat and its party are aimed. The concrete tactics for achieving general strategic tasks, Lenin said, is worked out on the basis of defining these tasks. He wrote: "By the Party's tactics we mean the Party's political conduct, or the character, direction, and methods of its political activity."[196] Hence the close unity of strategy and tactics as the essence and concrete means of realising the set aims.

The strategic task of the Bolshevik Party during this period consisted in fully utilising the principal imperialist contradiction—that between labour and capital—right until it was completely overcome, i.e. right until the victorious socialist revolution. The tactical tasks of this plan were to rally all the working masses around the proletariat and to mobilise them for revolutionary action against tsarism. These strategical and tactical tasks had been carried

out by October 1917, creating conditions for the victory of the first ever socialist revolution, which not only overthrew capitalism but also succeeded in consolidating the revolutionary gains.

Lenin's analysis of the problems of historical materialism during World War I includes, as its most important component, his ideas on the relation between the proletarian class struggle and the national liberation movements of the oppressed peoples in the colonies and dependent countries. Opportunists of all hues, both right and "left", repeatedly attempted to renounce the revolutionary role of non-proletarian movements. It will be recalled that, from Lassale to Kautsky, opportunists depicted peasants as an "amorphous reactionary mass", and their views of revolutionary action in the colonies and dependencies were in a similar vein.

Lenin opposed these anti-Marxist theories, pointing out that the peasantry in countries like Russia were the principal ally and reserve of the proletariat in its drive for socialist revolution. He emphasised that "in Russia the victory of the proletariat can be achieved in the very near future *only* if, from the very first step, the workers are supported by the vast majority of the peasants".[197] This is also true in the case of the national liberation movements of the oppressed peoples: "Increased national oppression under imperialism does not mean that Social-Democracy should reject what the bourgeoisie call the 'utopian' struggle for the freedom of nations to secede but, on the contrary, it should make greater use of the conflicts that arise in this sphere, *too*, as grounds for mass action and for revolutionary attacks on the bourgeoisie."[198] Lenin underlined that the proletariat of the oppressing nation can by no means stick to abstract slogans like the right opportunists do. Being an internationalist class, it must, while demanding freedom and equal rights for itself, demand freedom of economic and political development for all the peoples oppressed by its own nation.

At the same time, Lenin said, revolutionaries in the oppressed nations must steadily defend and realise the full, including organisational, unity of the working people of the oppressed nation and the proletariat of the oppressing nation. It is especially important to take the scientific and proletarian party view that nationalism and chauvinism

are an ideology hostile to the working people, no matter to which class they belong. The contemporary era, the era of imperialism and proletarian revolutions, according to Lenin, "must also necessarily engender and foster policies of struggle against national oppression and of proletarian struggle against the bourgeoisie and, consequently, also the possibility and inevitability, first, of revolutionary national rebellions and wars; second, of proletarian wars and rebellions *against* the bourgeoisie; and, third, of a combination of both kinds of revolutionary war".[199]

Further on Lenin proved that making use of the dialectical contradiction between monopoly alliances and groups of imperialist powers was a major tactical task facing the proletarian party in the struggle for a proletarian revolution. Examining how this contradiction could be utilised, Lenin singled out three most important aspects of this problem. The first was to determine the place and role of the scientific policy of the Communists in making use of the objective dialectics of social development in the age of imperialism. He characterised the policy of the Communist Party as the conscious application of the objective laws of the social process. This tenet dealt a blow to the dogmatic distortions of Marxism by the right opportunists. He disclosed the sophistry of the social-chauvinists and centrists who, during the imperialist war, urged to name the party in the international conflict which was waging a just war. Lenin showed that the contradictions which had arisen in the new conditions made both parties conservative and reactionary. Such contradictions could only be overcome by transforming both sides into their opposite, i.e. by destroying them as the dominant forces in their countries. In addition, Lenin also examined what happens when an imperialist power, which is undoubtedly a conservative force in the world's general social evolution, ostentatiously emphasised the "democracy" it has created for "its own" proletariat. This was true of Britain, the USA, France, Belgium and other imperialist states, where the local bourgeoisie, bearing in mind the revolutionary struggle under way in Russia, Germany, Hungary and other countries, set up a relatively high material standard of consumption for the more skilled workers of the prevailing nationality, and ceded them certain democratic rights. Lenin wrote: "Imperialism is the exploitation of

hundreds of millions in the dependent nations by a handful of very rich nations. Hence, the *possibility* of full democracy inside the richest nation *with its continued* domination over dependent nations." [200]

Lenin also sharply criticised Trotsky's demagogic call to transfer the capitalist experience of the USA to European soil and to establish an international "United States of Europe". He answered Trotsky as follows: "On the present economic basis, i.e., under *capitalism,* a United States of Europe would signify an organisation of reaction." [201]

Another major aspect of Lenin's study of the internal imperialist contradictions is connected with his analysis of the predatory wars characteristic of this stage of capitalism. Lenin's elaboration of the general Marxist view of wars as social phenomena should be noted first. In his *Socialism and War* (1915) Lenin cited the words of Karl Clausewitz: " 'War is the continuation of politics by other (i.e., violent) means' ", and pointed out that "Marxists have always rightly regarded this thesis as the theoretical basis of views on the significance of any war." [202]

Wars, being a special type of policy pursued by the exploiter classes, are shown by Lenin to be the outcome of the objective development of internal contradictions in class-antagonistic societies. Under imperialism, the development of internal capitalist contradictions inevitably leads to imperialist wars. And while previously wars were always unjust on the side of the aggressor and just and defensive on the side of the people defending its country and its wealth, under imperialism it is different. This is why Communists should struggle against wars which, are predatory in nature, and if such wars break out, they should struggle to change imperialist war into civil war, into a war of the proletariat against "its own" imperialist bourgeoisie and for a revolutionary destruction of the capitalist system as a whole. Lenin specially emphasised that Marxism was hostile to any pacifism: "Refusal to serve with the forces, anti-war strikes, etc., are sheer nonsense, the miserable and cowardly dream of an unarmed struggle, against the armed bourgeoisie .... It is the duty of every socialist to conduct propaganda of the class struggle, in the army as well." [203] Hence Lenin's idea that the party of the proletariat should make use of the conditions creat-

ed by imperialist wars to bring the socialist revolution nearer, to unite and mobilise the masses, first of all the workers, clad in greatcoats and armed, for the struggle against their own bourgeoisie, its state and social system.

Of special interest and relevance are Lenin's ideas on the dialectical link between the 20th-century world revolutionary process and the scientific and technical progress. Lenin put forward these ideas when capitalism was still a solid world system, yet to this day they have fully retained their relevance, i.e. to the era that began with the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution.

Lenin stressed that the forthcoming transition of human society from capitalism to socialism was prepared at the imperialist stage. This is directly related to his assessment of the place and social role of scientific and technical progress when the conditions for such a transition were being created. The technology of capitalism at the stage of imperialism is, as Lenin put it, nothing else but technological progress paving the way to socialism.[204]

Of vast importance are Lenin's remarks on the relation of capitalism to scientific and technical progress. Between 1914 and 1916, he investigated a wide range of economic, scientific and technological problems, which resulted in his "Notebooks on Imperialism", which contain a number of most significant generalisations, subsequently used in *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism* (1916). In the former he wrote: "On the concept of imperialism + + the artificial halting of progress (bying up the patents by the trusts: e.g., in this notebook the example of the German bottle manufacturers)."[205] Lenin cited an example from the "Causes of Crises", an article by a bourgeois German economist Alfred Lansburgh, who said that imperialist trusts often intentionally retarded new inventions and technological improvements, or bought them up in order to shelve them away.

Lenin assessed this fact, and many others, as more evidence of capitalism's decay: "Since monopoly prices are established, even temporarily, the motive cause of technical and, consequently, of all other progress disappears to a certain extent and, further, the *economic* possibility arises of deliberately retarding technical progress."[206] It goes without saying, of course, that general scientific and technical progress in human society goes on despite these

facts, which is proved by the tremendous advance in the development of science and technology in the late 19th and early 20th centuries—since it is profitable at certain moments, for monopolies to introduce inventions and discoveries into production. This is why, Lenin explained, the "possibility of reducing the cost of production and increasing profits by introducing technical improvements operates in the direction of change". [207]

But "in capitalist society, progress in science and technology means progress in the art of sweating", [208] i.e. it is aimed at further intensifying the exploitation of the working people. Making use of the latest scientific discoveries, capitalists "squeeze out of the worker three times more labour, mercilessly drain him of all his strength, and are three times faster in sucking out every drop of the wage slave's nervous and physical energy. And if he dies young? Well, there are many others waiting at the gate!" [209]

Lenin considered scientific and technical progress under modern capitalism a necessary element in the world revolutionary process. This idea is very important in evaluating the modern scientific and technological revolution, a revolution which is viewed by some bourgeois theoreticians and their revisionist apologists as a process independent of socio-revolutionary shifts, and sometimes even as an alternative to them.

Lenin examined a whole range of socio-philosophical problems during this period, while upholding and further developing Marx's theory of the state; his most important ideas on this score are formulated in *The State and Revolution* (1917).

Early in 1917, Lenin wrote in one of his letters: "I have been putting in a lot of study recently on the question of the attitude of Marxism to the *state;* I have collected a lot of material and arrived, it seemed to me, at very interesting ... conclusions." [210] This preparatory work made up a bulky manuscript, "Marxism on the State", which contains many of the synopses, remarks and quotations collected in his *Blue Notebook.* This work is very important in itself, for it is a concentrated exposition of the entire wealth of Marxist ideas on the state and the role it plays in the life of society. In August and September 1917, Lenin wrote one of his most important works—*The*

State and Revolution,[211] based on part of this material. He contemplated writing the second part of *The State and Revolution* on the material contained in "Marxism on the State" but this project was never realised. A note he wrote when going into hiding early in July 1917, after the Provisional Government had issued a warrant for his arrest, shows that Lenin laid great store by this manuscript: "Entre-nous: if they do me in, I ask you to publish my notebook: 'Marxism on the State'.... It's bound in a blue cover. It contains a collection of all the quotations from Marx and Engels, likewise from Kautsky against Pannekoek. There are a number of remarks and notes, and formulations. I think it could be published after a week's work. I believe it to be important, because not only Plekhanov but also Kautsky have bungled things."[212] In August 1917, while in hiding, Lenin wrote to his sister Maria Ulyanova from Helsingfors (now Helsinki): "I ... am working on the question of the state, which has interested me for a long time."[213]

Lenin first planned *The State and Revolution* to run to seven chapters, but he did not have time to write the last one, in which he intended to examine the experience gained in the 1905-07 Revolution. In his note to the publisher, he wrote that if he were late in writing the last, seventh, chapter or if it proved to be too long, the first six chapters should be printed as the first part.[214]

In September 1917, Lenin signed a contract with Zhizn i znaniye Publishers for seven of his works, *The State and Revolution* among them. The latter, however, was printed only in early 1918, after Soviet power had been established. It consisted of six chapters, and the title page carried the words "Part One", as Lenin had asked. He evidently planned to write the seventh chapter and publish it as Part Two. "Apart from the title, however," he wrote, "I had no time to write a single line of the chapter; I was 'interrupted' by a political crisis—the eve of the October Revolution of 1917. Such an 'interruption' can only be welcomed, but the writing of the second part of the pamphlet ('The Experience of the Russian Revolutions of 1905 and 1917') will probably have to be put off for a long time. It is more pleasant and useful to go through the 'experience of the revolution' than to write about it."[215]

Lenin's book on the state and revolution has come down in the treasure-house of Marxist theory as the most far-reaching and comprehensive classification of the Marxist teaching on the state, one of the most important fields of historical materialism. It examines the relationship between a class society and the state, and between the state and revolution, generalises from the experience gained in the 1848-51 revolutions and the Paris Commune of 1871, reveals the economic conditions for the withering away of the state under communism and criticises at length the social-reformist and left-anarchist opportunistic distortions of the Marxist position on these issues.

Lenin begins his analysis by examining the place and role of the state in a class society. He shows that the state, as the outcome of irreconcilable class contradictions, is an apparatus used by the propertied minority to exercise coercion over the working majority. The state in a class society is an immediate product and result of the irreconcilable class contradictions. It is a political organisation of the class prevailing in the economy, politics and ideology of a given society, it is established to suppress by force the resistance of the oppressed classes. The state is an essential element of the superstructure.

The main features of the state are: a territory on which its power is exercised, an apparatus for administration, and special armed detachments subordinated to it—an army, police force, etc., as well as courts of law, prisons and other institutions set up by the ruling class to maintain coercion over the working masses. The type of state corresponds to the type of socio-economic system—there are slave-owning, feudal, and capitalist states. Each historical type of state can assume various forms: despotic rule (monarchy), a republic, etc. The forms of state may differ in the nature of their power,—one-man rule, the rule of an oligarchy, or democratic-representative rule. Yet the essence of a state in a class society remains the same—it is the coercion the ruling class exercises over the oppressed working people. Resistance to this coercion in a class society results in the emergence of a movement of the oppressed masses, aimed at doing away with the existing authority, i.e. at eliminating the given state. The ruling class, for its part, takes measures to strengthen the state apparatus in order to retain its power.

Hence the main conclusion: the state has not always existed and will not exist for ever; it is a historical product of class contradictions and must disappear after these contradictions have been solved. Lenin said on this score: "The suppression of the bourgeois state by the proletarian state is impossible without a violent revolution. The abolition of the proletarian state, i.e., of the state in general, is impossible except through the process of 'withering away'." [216]

Lenin dwells particularly on the smashing of the old state machine and of the withering away of the state, because a number of right and "left" opportunists distorted Marx's ideas and arbitrarily tied in one with the other. Lenin considered these the attempts to substitute sophistry and eclecticism for Marxist materialist dialectics. In actual fact Marx's idea of the need for a forcible smashing of the bourgeois state machine is related to his description of the proletarian revolution, while the withering away of the state relates to the future development of the proletarian state that emerges after the victorious socialist revolution and is both a necessary condition for and a real form of consolidating and developing its gains.

Lenin exposed the essence and meaning of Marx's ideas on the state advanced on the basis of the experience of the 19th-century revolutions. He singled out Marx's idea of the breakup of the bourgeois state machine as an indispensable condition for the victory of the proletarian revolution and an examination, on the experience of the Paris Commune, of the essence of a new proletarian state as the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat. He also described the economic requisites for the state to wither away under developed socialism — socialisation of the means of production, development of new, genuinely equal social relations; and the involvement of all the working people, as conscious builders of communism, in administering the state.

Lenin developed and substantiated these ideas while sharply criticising opportunistic distortions of the Marxist interpretation of the state and revolution. He analysed the ideas of Kautsky, who came out against the breakup of the bourgeois state machine and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat in the course of the revolution. He also criticised the leftist, anarcho-syndicalist

theories of "abolishing" or "blowing up" the state, as not necessary to the revolution. He stressed that the state would be indispensable to the proletariat for a long time to come after the victory of the revolution, and that its gradual withering away would encompass a long historical period during which society would change from capitalism to the first phase of communism—socialism, and then to its highest phase.

Lenin's substantiation of the essence and salient features of the new socialist state to be established after the victory of the proletarian revolution, is the core of *The State and Revolution.* He gives an all-round description of socialist democracy as the highest type of popular rule history has known. He points out that "when *all* have learned to administer and actually do independently administer social production, independently keep accounts and exercise control ... then the door will be thrown wide open for the transition from the first phase of communist society to its higher phase, and with it to the complete withering away of the state." [217]

Lenin showed that in the course of transition from capitalism to socialism the revolutionary working class, allied with all the working people, breaks up the bourgeois state machine by force. The victorious socialist revolution replaces it with a state, which is new in principle—the dictatorship of the proletariat, a form of the class union of the workers and all the working people and the propertyless classes, with the working class in the lead. As the socialist society develops, the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat gradually turns into a state of the whole people, which in turn is the beginning of transition from state administration to communist social self-government.

The principal functions of the socialist state are: defence of revolutionary gains; building of a socialist economy; socio-political activity aimed at establishing and developing socialist and communist social relations; and cultural and ideological work aimed at creating and promoting a socialist and communist consciousness.

At the contemporary stage, the defence of revolutionary gains, the first function, implies safeguarding the socialist country from all encroachments by the imperialist forces from without. In this case, it is only with respect to international imperialism that the socialist state retains

its functions as the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat whereas with respect to Soviet society and the other socialist countries it is a state of the whole people. The second, economic and organisational, function amounts in Soviet society to administering the construction of the material and technical basis of socialism and communism. With respect to the world system of imperialism, this function is a form of class struggle, taking the form of peaceful economic competition between socialism and capitalism.

Lenin stressed the importance of the third function of the new state, that of establishing and developing new social relations, i.e. consolidating and developing socialist state system and politics. In the long run these will develop, as communist construction proceeds, into communist self-government, while politics (as well as the law) as a form of social consciousness will be replaced by a universal communist morality based on a scientific knowledge of the laws of social development. With respect to the capitalist world, this function is a specific form of class struggle, taking the form of peaceful competition between countries with different socio-political systems.

The last function of the new state—cultural and ideological—is aimed at providing Soviet people with communist education, i.e. educating them in the spirit of genuine communist ideology and consciousness, and devotion to the ideals of socialism and communism. With respect to the capitalist system, this function takes the form of unrelentless class and ideological struggle against the various trends of the bourgeois world outlook and its reformist and revisionist flunkeys.

Thus, the functions of the socialist state—which does not favour any particular class within Soviet society and is the organ of power of the whole people—fully retain their class content with respect to capitalism and are the forms of class struggle between socialism and capitalism in all its main aspects.

Lenin's *The State and Revolution* is an important contribution to the ideological and theoretical armoury of the working-class party. Its ideas are to this day a relevant and powerful weapon in the hands of the Communists in their efforts to develop Marxism-Leninism, and to expose and criticise anti-Marxist ideas on social development.

* * *

As a whole, Lenin's development of Marxist philosophy during World War I and on the eve of the Great October Socialist Revolution was a great historical landmark in the evolution of Leninism. This period is justifiably considered as one of the most significant in the entire Leninist stage. *Philosophical Notebooks, Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism, The State and Revolution, The Collapse of the Second International, Socialism and War,* and other works written by Lenin over this period, continue to play a tremendous role in tackling the new theoretical and practical tasks confronting the world communist movement.

---

[1] V. I. Lenin, "What the 'Friends of the People' Are and How They Fight the Social-Democrats", *Collected Works,* Vol. 1, p. 159.
[2] *Ibid.*
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 160.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 300.
[5] V. I. Lenin, "What Is to Be Done?", *Collected Works,* Vol. 5, p. 353.
[6] V. I. Lenin, "The Economic Content of Narodism and the Criticism of It in Mr. Struve's Book", *Collected Works,* Vol. 1, pp. 400-401.
[7] V. I. Lenin, "Frederick Engels", *Collected Works,* Vol. 2, p. 27.
[8] *Ibid.*
[9] Quoted from: V. I. Lenin, "A Protest by Russian Social-Democrats", *Collected Works,* Vol. 4, pp. 173, 174.
[10] V. I. Lenin, Notes, *Collected Works,* Vol. 4, p. 438.
[11] V. I. Lenin, "A Protest by Russian Social-Democrats", *Collected Works,* Vol. 4, p. 176.
[12] *Ibid.*, p. 177.
[13] *Ibid.*, p. 179.
[14] See V. I. Lenin, "A Retrograde Trend in Russian Social-Democracy", *Collected Works,* Vol. 4, p. 285.
[15] V. I. Lenin, "What Is To Be Done?", *Collected Works,* Vol. 5, pp. 363-364.
[16] *Ibid.*, p. 374.
[17] *Ibid.*, pp. 382-383.
[18] *Ibid.*, p. 384.
[19] *Ibid.*, p. 393.
[20] *Ibid.*, pp. 393-394.
[21] *Ibid.*, pp. 394-395.
[22] *Ibid.*, p. 396.
[23] *Ibid.*, pp. 374-375.
[24] *Ibid.*
[25] V. I. Lenin, "Draft and Explanation of a Programme for the Social-Democratic Party", *Collected Works,* Vol. 2, pp. 113-114.

[26] V. I. Lenin, "What Is To Be Done?", *Collected Works,* Vol. 5, p. 375.
[27] *Ibid.*
[28] *Ibid.*, pp. 375-376.
[29] V. I. Lenin, "What Is To Be Done?", *Collected Works,* Vol. 5, p. 375.
[30] *Ibid.*, p. 412.
[31] *Ibid.*, pp. 412-413.
[32] *Ibid.*, p. 372.
[33] V. I. Lenin, "The Economic Content of Narodism and the Criticism of It in Mr. Struve's Book", *Collected Works,* Vol. 1, p. 401.
[34] V. I. Lenin, "Draft and Explanation of a Programme for the Social-Democratic Party", *Collected Works,* Vol. 2, pp: 112-113.
[35] V. I. Lenin, "What Is To Be Done?", *Collected Works,* Vol. 5, p. 354.
[36] *Ibid.*, p. 365.
[37] *Ibid.*, p. 369.
[38] *Ibid.*, p. 371.
[39] *Ibid.*, p. 371.
[40] *Ibid.*, p. 370.
[41] *Ibid.*, p. 369.
[42] V. I. Lenin, "What Is To Be Done?", *Collected Works,* Vol. 5, p. 370.
[43] *Ibid.*, p. 374.
[44] *Ibid.*, p. 372.
[45] *Ibid.*, p. 375.
[46] *Ibid.*, p. 386.
[47] V. I. Lenin, "What Is To Be Done?", *Collected Works,* Vol. 5, p. 384.
[48] *Ibid.*, p. 452.
[49] *Ibid.*, p. 478.
[50] *Ibid.*, p. 429.
[51] *Ibid.*, p. 469.
[52] *Ibid.*, pp. 468-469.
[53] *Ibid.*, p. 514.
[54] *Reports Given by the Social-Democratic Committees to the Second Congress of the RSDLP,* Moscow-Leningrad, 1930, p. 44 (in Russian).
[55] Quoted from V. I. Lenin, *Complete Works,* Fifth Russ. ed., Vol. 6, p. 466.
[56] *The Bund* (full name—The General Jewish Social-Democratic Union)—a Social-Democratic party that included Jewish workers in Russia's western gubernias (provinces) between 1897 and 1921. It joined and left the RSDLP many times, and acted together with the Mensheviks. In 1919, the Bund's revolutionary wing joined the Ukrainian Communist Party (Bolsheviks). The rest of the party dissolved itself in 1921.
[57] V. I. Lenin, "One Step Forward, Two Steps Back (The Crisis in Our Party)", *Collected Works,* Vol. 7, p. 415.
[58] *Ibid.*, p. 411.
[59] *Ibid.*, p. 412.
[60] V. I. Lenin, "The Beginning of the Revolution in Russia", *Collected Works,* Vol. 8, pp. 97-100.

[61] V. I. Lenin, "The Beginning of the Revolution in Russia", *Collected Works,* Vol. 8, p. 99.
[62] V. I. Lenin, "Two Tactics of Social-Democracy in the Democratic Revolution", *Collected Works,* Vol. 9, p. 22.
[63] *Ibid.,* p. 19.
[64] V. I. Lenin, "Two Tactics of Social-Democracy in the Democratic Revolution", *Collected Works,* Vol. 9, p. 52.
[65] *Ibid.,* p. 57.
[66] *Ibid.,* p. 28.
[67] *Ibid.,* p. 29.
[68] *Ibid.,* p. 100.
[69] *Ibid.,* p. 113.
[70] *Ibid.*
[71] V. I. Lenin, *Complete Works,* Fifth Russ. ed., Vol. 11, pp. 438-439.
[72] V. I. Lenin, "Party Organisation and Party Literature", *Collected Works,* Vol. 10, p. 44.
[73] *Ibid.,* p. 45.
[74] *Ibid.,* p. 47.
[75] *Ibid.,* p. 48.
[76] *Ibid.,* p. 49.
[77] See Karl Marx, "Contribution to the Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Law", in Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, *Collected Works,* Vol. 3, p. 175.
[78] V. I. Lenin, "Socialism and Religion", *Collected Works,* Vol. 10, p. 83.
[79] *Ibid.,* p. 83-84.
[80] *God-seeking*—a bourgeois ideological trend that emerged among the liberal bourgeois intelligentsia in the first decade of the 20th century. It made its aim the search for a "new" Christianity, free from the defects of the existing Christian churches and capable of attracting the people. It tried to distract the Russian revolutionary working people from their struggle against tsarism and capitalism.
[81] *God-building*—an ideological, religious and philosophical trend that was taken up by a few Russian Social-Democrats after the defeat of the 1905 revolution. It tried to combine socialist ideas with a "new" religion to support the fervour of the people during the tsarist reaction which followed the defeat of the revolution. It was criticised by Lenin and his disciples as a departure from the basic principles of the revolutionary theory of Marxism.
[82] V. I. Lenin, "The Attitude of the Workers' Party to Religion", *Collected Works,* Vol. 15, p. 409.
[83] V. I. Lenin, "A Letter to A. M. Gorky", *Collected Works,* Vol. 13, pp. 448-449.
[84] Zerno Publishers, St. Petersburg, 1908.
[85] V. I. Lenin, "A Letter to A. M. Gorky", *Collected Works,* Vol. 13, p. 450.
[86] See V. I. Lenin, "Marxism and Revisionism", *Collected Works,* Vol. 15, p. 34.
[87] V. I. Lenin, "Ten Questions to a Lecturer", *Collected Works,* Vol. 14, p. 15.
[88] V. I. Lenin, "Materialism and Empirio-Criticism", *Collected Works,* Vol. 14, p. 19.

[89] V. I. Lenin, "Materialism and Empirio-Criticism", *Collected Works*, Vol. 14, p. 326.
[90] V. I. Lenin, "Materialism and Empirio-Criticism", *Collected Works*, Vol. 14, p. 143.
[91] *Ibid.*, p. 46.
[92] V. I. Lenin, "Materialism and Empirio-Criticism", *Collected Works*, Vol. 14, p. 130.
[93] *Ibid.*, p. 110.
[94] *Ibid.*, p. 190.
[95] *Ibid.*, p. 103.
[96] *Ibid.*, p. 51.
[97] *Ibid.*, p. 55.
[98] V. I. Lenin, "Materialism and Empirio-Criticism", *Collected Works*, Vol. 14, p. 122.
[99] *Ibid.*, p. 135.
[100] *Ibid.*, p. 137.
[101] *Ibid.*, p. 137.
[102] *Ibid.*, p. 140.
[103] *Ibid.*, p. 162.
[104] V. I. Lenin, "Materialism and Empirio-Criticism", *Collected Works*, Vol. 14, p. 337.
[105] *Ibid.*, p. 258.
[106] *Ibid.*, pp. 260-61.
[107] *Ibid.*, p. 313.
[108] *Ibid.*, p. 312.
[109] *Ibid.*, p. 262.
[110] *Ibid.*, p. 339.
[111] *Ibid.*, p. 358.
[112] V. I. Lenin, "Marxism and Revisionism", *Collected Works*, Vol. 15, p. 32.
[113] *Ibid.*, p. 33.
[114] *Ibid.*, p. 37.
[115] *Ibid.*, p. 39.
[116] Vekhi, *A Collection of Articles on Russian Intelligentsia*, Moscow, 1909, p. 88 (in Russian).
[117] V. Shulyatikov, *The Justification of Capitalism in West European Philosophy from Descartes to E. Mach*, Moscow, 1908, pp. 26, 42, 45 (in Russian).
[118] V. I. Lenin, "Remarks in Books", *Collected Works*, Vol. 38, p. 502.
[119] See V. I. Lenin, "Materialism and Empirio-Criticism", *Collected Works*, Vol. 14, pp. 357-358.
[120] *The otzovists* (from the Russian word "otzyv"—"recall")—a section among the Bolsheviks emerged in 1906-1907 and criticised by Lenin, which demanded the recall of the Bolsheviks from the State Duma (Assembly) and to use only illegal methods of struggle.
[121] *The August Bloc*—was organised by Trotsky in 1912, united anti-Bolshevik and anti-Leninist groupings in Russian Social-Democracy—Liquidators, otzovists and Trotskyites. It advocated abandonment of the workers' chief demands in the economy and politics, conciliation with the bourgeoisie and the ideological subordination of the proletariat to the bourgeoisie. The bloc disintegrated in 1913-1914 as a result of Lenin's condemnation of it.

[122] V. I. Lenin, "The Beginning of Demonstrations," *Collected Works,* Vol. 16, p. 358.
[123] See V. I. Lenin, "Certain Features of the Historical Development of Marxism", *Collected Works,* Vol. 17, p. 39.
[124] *Ibid.,* p. 44.
[125] *The Decembrists*—revolutionary noblemen in Russia in the first quarter of the 19th century, who on December 25, 1825 made an attempt at a revolutionary coup d'état in St. Petersburg (hence their name). They aimed to abolish autocracy and serfdom. Tsarism ruthlessly dealt with the Decembrists, but they inspired the finest Russians to revolutionary struggle, among them Herzen, Ogarev, Belinsky, Chernyshevsky, and Dobrolyubov.
[126] V. I. Lenin, "In Memory of Herzen", *Collected Works,* Vol. 18, p. 26.
[127] *Ibid.,* p. 31.
[128] *Ibid.*
[129] V. I. Lenin, "The Historical Destiny of the Doctrine of Karl Marx", *Collected Works,* Vol. 18, p. 582.
[130] *Ibid.,* p. 584.
[131] V. I. Lenin, "The Three Sources and Three Component Parts of Marxism", *Collected Works,* Vol. 19, p. 23.
[132] *Ibid.,* p. 24.
[133] V. I. Lenin, "The Three Sources and Three Component Parts of Marxism", *Collected Works,* Vol. 19, p. 25.
[134] *Ibid.,* p. 28.
[135] *Der Briefwechsel zwischen Friedrich Engels und Karl Marx, 1844 bis 1883,* Hrsg, von A. Bebel und Ed. Bernstein, Vol. 1-4, Dietz. Stuttgart, 1913.
[136] V. I. Lenin, "The Marx-Engels Correspondence", *Collected Works,* Vol. 19, p. 552.
[137] V. I. Lenin "To His Sister Maria", *Collected Works,* Vol. 37, p. 504.
[138] V. I. Lenin, *Conspectus of Marx-Engels Correspondences 1844-1883,* Moscow, 1959 (in Russian).
[139] V. I. Lenin, "The Marx-Engels Correspondence", *Collected Works,* Vol. 19, p. 554.
[140] V. I. Lenin, "Socialism and War", *Collected Works,* Vol. 21, p. 309.
[141] *Social-chauvinism*—an ideological stand taken by several leaders of the European Social-Democratic parties after the start of the 1914-1918 imperialist war. It advocated that the workers of each belligerent country support their own government. Lenin confronted social-chauvinist ideas by calling for the imperialist war to be turned into a civil one, a war of the working people against their "own" bourgeoisie and their regimes.
[142] V. I. Lenin, "Philosophical Notebooks", *Collected Works,* Vol. 38, p. 223.
[143] *Ibid.,* pp. 221-222.
[144] V. I. Lenin, "Philosophical Notebooks", *Collected Works,* Vol. 38, p. 360.
[145] V. I. Lenin, "Conspectus of Hegel's Book *Lectures on the History of Philosophy*", *Collected Works,* Vol. 38, p. 284.
[146] V. I. Lenin, "Conspectus of Hegel's Book *The Science of Logic*", *Collected Works,* Vol. 38, p. 93.

147 *Ibid.*, p. 91.
148 V. I. Lenin, "Philosophical Notebooks", *Collected Works*, Vol. 38, p. 319.
149 *Ibid.*, p. 362.
150 *Ibid.*, p. 363.
151 *Ibid.*, p. 279.
152 V. I. Lenin, "Philosophical Notebooks", *Collected Works*, Vol. 38, p. 227.
153 *Ibid.*, p. 319.
154 *Ibid.*, p. 320.
155 See Karl Marx, *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1978, pp. 205-206.
156 V. I. Lenin, "Philosophical Notebooks", *Collected Works*, Vol. 38, p. 319.
157 *Ibid.*, p. 158.
158 V. I. Lenin, "Philosophical Notebooks", *Collected Works*, Vol. 38, pp. 92-93.
159 *Ibid.*, p. 319.
160 V. I. Lenin, "Philosophical Notebooks", *Collected Works*, Vol. 38, p. 110.
161 *Ibid.*, p. 171.
162 V. I. Lenin, "Philosophical Notebooks", *Collected Works*, Vol. 38, p. 190.
163 *Ibid.*, p. 173.
164 *Ibid.*, pp. 212-213.
165 V. I. Lenin, "Philosophical Notebooks", *Collected Works*, Vol. 38, p. 213.
166 *Ibid.*, p. 217.
167 *Ibid.*, p. 218.
168 *Ibid.*, p. 194.
169 V. I. Lenin, "Philosophical Notebooks", *Collected Works*, Vol. 38, p. 189.
170 *Ibid.*, p. 187.
171 *Ibid.*, p. 219.
172 See V. I. Lenin, "Philosophical Notebooks", *Collected Works*, Vol. 38, p. 218.
173 *Ibid.*, p. 213.
174 V. I. Lenin, "Philosophical Notebooks", *Collected Works*, Vol. 38, p. 318.
175 *Ibid.*, p. 320.
176 V. I. Lenin, "The Development of Capitalism in Russia", *Collected Works*, Vol. 3, p. 599.
177 See V. I. Lenin, "A New Chapter of World History", *Collected Works*, Vol. 18, p. 368; see also "Dead Chauvinism and Living Socialism", *Collected Works*, Vol. 21, p. 98.
178 V. I. Lenin, "Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism", *Collected Works*, Vol. 22, p. 260.
179 *Ibid.*
180 V. I. Lenin, "The Collapse of the Second International", *Collected Works*, Vol. 21, p. 235.
181 *Ibid.*, pp. 233-236.
182 V. I. Lenin, "Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism", *Collected Works*, Vol. 22, p. 298.

[183] V. I. Lenin, "Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism", *Collected Works,* Vol. 22, p. 196.
[184] *Ibid.,* p. 205.
[185] V. I. Lenin, "Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism", *Collected Works,* Vol. 22, p. 243.
[186] Britain and France concluded *L'Entente Cordiale* in 1904; Russia joined in 1907.
[187] V. I. Lenin, "On the Slogan for a United States of Europe", *Collected Works,* Vol. 21, p. 341.
[188] *Ibid.,* p. 342.
[189] V. I. Lenin, "Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism", *Collected Works,* Vol. 22, p. 300.
[190] *Ibid.,* p. 302.
[191] V. I. Lenin, "On the Slogan for a United States of Europe", *Collected Works,* Vol. 21, p. 342.
[192] V. I. Lenin, "The Military Programme of the Proletarian Revolution", *Collected Works,* Vol. 23, 1974, p. 79.
[193] See V. I. Lenin, "The Collapse of the Second International", *Collected Works,* Vol. 21, pp. 213, 214.
[194] V. I. Lenin, "On the Slogan for a United States of Europe", *Collected Works,* Vol. 21, p. 342.
[195] V. I. Lenin, "On the Two Lines in the Revolution", *Collected Works,* Vol. 21, p. 418.
[196] V. I. Lenin, "Two Tactics of Social-Democracy in the Democratic Revolution", *Collected Works,* Vol. 9, p. 22.
[197] V. I. Lenin, "Letters from Afar", *Collected Works,* Vol. 23, pp. 340-341.
[198] V. I. Lenin, "The Socialist Revolution and the Right of Nations to Self-Determination", *Collected Works,* Vol. 22, p. 146.
[199] V. I. Lenin, "The Military Programme of the Proletarian Revolution", *Collected Works,* Vol. 23, p. 80.
[200] V. I. Lenin, "Remarks on an Article about Maximalism", *Collected Works,* Vol. 41, p. 385.
[201] V. I. Lenin, "On the Slogan for a United States of Europe", *Collected Works,* Vol. 21, p. 342.
[202] V. I. Lenin, "Socialism and War", *Collected Works,* Vol. 21, p. 304.
[203] V. I. Lenin, "The Position and Tasks of the Socialist International", *Collected Works,* Vol. 21, p. 40.
[204] See V. I. Lenin, "Notebooks on Imperialism", *Collected Works,* Vol. 39, p. 160.
[205] V. I. Lenin, "Notebooks on Imperialism", *Collected Works,* Vol. 39, p. 116.
[206] V. I. Lenin, "Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism", *Collected Works,* Vol. 22, p. 276.
[207] *Ibid.*
[208] V. I. Lenin, "A 'Scientific' System of Sweating", *Collected Works,* Vol. 18, p. 595.
[209] *Ibid.,* p. 594.
[210] V. I. Lenin, "Letter to Inessa Armand", *Collected Works,* Vol. 35, p. 289.
[211] During half a century of the existence of Soviet power, this work was printed about 200 times in 46 languages of the Soviet Union; the overall number of copies exceeds six and a half mil-

lion. It was also published over 100 times abroad, in 35 languages, and is now the most widely read Lenin's work.

[212] V. I. Lenin, "Note to L. B. Kamenev", *Collected Works*, Vol. 36, Moscow, 1970, p. 454.

[213] V. I. Lenin, "To His Sister Maria", *Collected Works*, Vol. 37, p. 540.

[214] See V. I. Lenin, *Complete Works*, Vol. 33, p. 345 (in Russian).

[215] V. I. Lenin, "The State and Revolution", *Collected Works*, Vol. 25, p. 497.

[216] V. I. Lenin, "The State and Revolution", *Collected Works*, Vol. 25, p. 405.

[217] V. I. Lenin, "The State and Revolution", *Collected Works*, Vol. 25, p. 479.

CHAPTER III

Philosophical Problems of Leninism after the October Revolution

1. Lenin and Soviet Philosophy

After the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution, Marxism-Leninism, a genuinely scientific world outlook, became the prevailing ideology in the Soviet Union.

A wide range of new tasks to be tackled in this new historical situation confronted Marxist-Leninist philosophy. First of all, it had scientifically to analyse and assess the new historical era that had set in as a result of the victorious October Revolution, an era in which humankind was to change over from capitalism to socialism. Then, it had to interpret in philosophical terms, and without delay at that, the development of the Russian socialist revolution in all its aspects—in economy, social and political affairs, ideology and culture. Recent advances in science and technology had to be sized up, and the dynamics of society's spiritual development in social science, literature, and other spheres of social consciousness had to be brought out.

Lenin was the founder of Soviet philosophy. Though deeply immersed in activities connected with the leadership of the Party and Soviet state in the post-October years, Lenin kept a close watch on Soviet philosophical science in the making. The significance of the philosophical works he wrote in these years is great indeed. Many fundamental problems of Marxist philosophy in the changed historical conditions were examined in his reports, speeches and addresses, as well as in many of his works, such as

"The Immediate Tasks of the Soviet Government", "The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky" (1918); "A Great Beginning", "On the State", "Economics and Politics in the Era of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat" (1919); "'Left-Wing Communism'—an Infantile Disorder", "On Proletarian Culture" (1920); "Once More on the Trade Unions, the Current Situation and the Mistakes of Trotsky and Bukharin" (1921); "On the Significance of Militant Materialism", "On Cooperation", "Our Revolution", "Better Fewer But Better" (1922).

Among the great variety of philosophical problems he investigated, the following should be specially pointed out: the subject-matter and essence of Marxist philosophy as a science; the theory of materialist dialectics; the general laws of social development at the new historical stage; and finally, the ways to develop Marxist philosophical knowledge under the new social system.

When treating the subject-matter and essence of Marxist philosophy, its contents and structure, Lenin emphasised that its development rests on the materialist tradition which it inherited from the best representatives of pre-Marxist philosophical thought. Marxism is not just materialism, Lenin said, but *dialectical* materialism, i.e. the essence of Marxist philosophy consists in an organic unity of materialism and dialectics. Without this unity, Lenin wrote, Marxist philosophical materialism "cannot be militant materialism. It will be not so much the fighter as the fought, to use an expression of Shchedrin's".[1] Hence the need comprehensively to study the material nature and dialectical essence of the more general laws governing the world's development is the subject-matter of Marxist philosophy. According to Lenin, philosophical problems of nature (where philosophical analysis should be based on advanced natural science), society (where philosophy should secure the unity of all the social sciences based on Marxism) and human thinking (which should be studied in the context of philosophy, with account being taken of the most recent achievements in social sciences) are the structural elements of dialectical and historical materialism, making up the single philosophical theory of Marxism.

The unity of ideological, methodological, social and political (including general humanitarian) tasks which confront Marxist philosophy in the new society, is specially

emphasised in Lenin's post-October works. The science of philosophy, Lenin said, arms the Communists and all the working people led by them with a consistent scientific world outlook, an outlook which imbues them with historical optimism and makes them aware of their historical mission and of the conformity between the tasks they are fulfilling and the objective laws of the material world. It also supplies the theory of knowledge and man's practical activity with scientific methods of analysing, assessing and transforming the surrounding world. Marxist philosophy is indissolubly linked with the theory of scientific socialism, i.e. with determining the methods and purposes of man's knowledge and practical activities, and is vitally important in educating the working people along communist lines, in shaping a new, socialist consciousness and a new, socialist man.

Lenin's ideas provided the groundwork for the subsequent development of Marxist theory, for the ideological work of the Communist Party and for organising ideological education in socialist society.

In his work *The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky* Lenin exposed the cardinal difference between dialectics and eclecticism. He wrote: "The eclectic does not want propositions that are 'too absolute', because he wants to push forward his philistine desire to substitute '*transitional stages*' for revolution".[2] Kautsky and other social-reformists went out of their way to prove the "unlawfulness" of the October Revolution, and advanced all kind of petty-bourgeois theories of "evolution", "transitional stages", etc. to oppose the Marxist idea of the dictatorship of the proletariat. "Therein, theoretically, philosophically, lies their substitution of eclecticism and sophistry for dialectics. Dialectics are concrete and revolutionary and distinguish between the 'transition' from the dictatorship of one class to the dictatorship of another and 'transition' from the democratic proletarian state to the non-state ('the withering away of the state'). To please the bourgeoisie, the eclecticism and sophistry of the Kautskys and Vanderveldes blur all that is concrete and precise in the class struggle and advance instead the general concept 'transition', under which they may hide (and *nine-tenths* of the official *Social-Democrats* of our time *do hide*) their renunciation of revolution!" [3] Lenin's *The Proletarian Revolution*

Cacophony = harsh, jarring sound; bad, evil.

and the Renegade Kautsky sums up the experience gained in the 1905 and 1917 Russian revolutions and is in fact an outline of the second part of Lenin's *The State and Revolution* which he planned to write but never did. In this work, Lenin provides a detailed characterisation of materialist dialectics and explains how it should be applied to analysis of the revolutionary events in Russia and the first steps taken by Soviet power.

The problem of dialectical contradictions is another important issue of dialectics worked out by Lenin after the October Revolution. Analysing the dialectical contradictions of class-antagonistic systems and the specific contradictions inherent in socialism, Lenin formulated one of his most famous propositions: "Antagonism and contradiction are not the same thing. The former will disappear, while the latter will remain under socialism."[4] He also proved that there is no insurmountable wall between antagonistic and non-antagonistic contradictions: their relationship is as dialectical as the contradictions themselves.

Lenin examined this problem in connection with the question of whether bourgeois experts should be employed in the building of socialism. "We . . . have to build communist society with the aid of our enemies. This looks like a contradiction, an irreconcilable contradiction, perhaps. As a matter of fact, this is the only way the problem of building communism can be solved . . . The bourgeois experts must be hemmed in by our organised, constructive and united activities so that they will be compelled to fall in line with the proletariat."[5]

In his *Philosophical Notebooks* Lenin wrote that dialectics is a science concerned with the unity of opposites, their struggle and their mutual transition. Later, in the Soviet period, he repeatedly drew the Marxists' attention to the fact that relations between opposites invariably include the transition of antagonistic contradictions into non-antagonistic ones, and vice versa: "But after all we do have some knowledge of Marxism and have learned how and when opposites can and must be combined, and what is most important is that in the three and a half years of our revolution we have actually combined opposites again and again . . . After all, these opposite terms can be combined either into a cacophony or a symphony."[6]

As applied to the "epoch of great leaps"—as Lenin de-

scribed the first few years after the October Revolution—he described the ways and means of solving dialectical contradictions: "The real interest of the epoch of great leaps lies in the fact that the abundance of fragments of the old, which sometimes accumulate more rapidly than the rudiments (not always immediately discernible) of the new, calls for the ability to discern what is most important in the line or chain of development.... You must be able at each particular moment to find the particular link in the chain which you must grasp with all your might in order to hold the whole chain."[7]

All these propositions of Lenin's are permeated with one central idea: the struggle of opposites, which is the source of all evolution and must be made full use of as the theoretical basis for the scientific transformation of a society on the road to communism. The ideas Lenin advanced on dialectics after the October Revolution are based on the view of dialectics as an organic unity of the theory of cognising the world and its revolutionary-transforming role. This reveals yet another feature of dialectics: its use in practice to achieve a revolutionary transformation of the world.

The fundamental postulates of dialectical logic which Lenin formulated are a solid contribution to materialist dialectics. In criticising Trotsky's and Bukharin's eclectical approach to the role of the trade unions ("on the one hand...", "on the other hand...") Lenin pointed out that the dialectical approach demands, in the first place, comprehensive, integral assessment of the object. Secondly, dialectical logic considers an object in development, in self-movement. Thirdly, it takes account of the entire experience accumulated by humankind. Fourthly, it holds that truth is always concrete,[8] never abstract.

Lenin enriched and advanced historical materialism, the Marxist theory of social development. Of paramount importance are his ideas on classes and the class struggle. In his work *A Great Beginning* he provided an exhaustive, scientific definition of classes: "Classes are large groups of people differing from each other by the place they occupy in a historically determined system of social production, by their relation (in most cases, fixed and formulated in law) to the means of production, by their role in the social organisation of labour, and, consequently, by the

dimensions of the share of social wealth of which they dispose and the mode of acquiring it. Classes are groups of people one of which can appropriate the labour of another owing to the different places they occupy in a definite system of social economy."[9] The most important features of classes are emphasised here:

a) the place held by a class in a particular system of social production, i.e. its share in social labour (for example, in the production of the means of production or consumer goods, in intellectual labour, in ensuring the defence capability, in the coercion of the oppressed classes by the ruling class, in political, religious, scientific and cultural activities, etc.);

b) the relation of each class to the means of production, i.e. the prevailing form of ownership (in a class society, private property is in the hands of the ruling classes, while the oppressed classes are completely or almost completely dispossessed of it);

c) the role played by each class in the social organisation of labour, i.e. its relation to control over social processes, such as social production and other spheres of social life and the subjugation of the oppressed classes by the ruling classes);

d) the modes of acquiring social wealth and its share appropriated by each class (the exploiter classes' appropriation of surplus-value as income or rent, and satisfying the minimum requirements of the oppressed classes in kind or in cash).

Lenin's characterisation of classes applies primarily to antagonistic social and economic systems. Classes in a socialist society radically differ from all those existing previously and have specific features, which stem from the existence of two types of socialist property—the property of the whole state and that of collective farms and cooperatives. This in turn brings about a distinction between industrial and agricultural labour performed by the two major classes in a socialist society. As this society develops, that distinction is gradually obliterated and finally, when the society achieves communism, it disappears altogether. As for the role played by the working class and the peasantry in the social organisation of labour, and the mode of acquiring social wealth and its share they receive under socialism, their participation in labour organi-

sation and distribution is based on full equality, economic, political and ideological, although the working class retains its political and ideological leadership.

Lenin also analysed the class struggle under the dictatorship of the proletariat, and singled out five new forms which the class struggle takes at this stage. The first, he said, was the suppression of the exploiters who were out to win back their privileges, eliminated by the revolution. The second was closely linked with the first—this was the civil war in Soviet Russia unleashed by what was left of the exploiter classes as an extreme expression of their resistance to the revolutionary classes. The role played by the petty bourgeoisie at the stage of transition from capitalism to socialism, was marked by contradictions and duplicity. This explains the third form taken by the class struggle at the transitional stage—that of neutralising the petty bourgeoisie which was the most unstable and vacillating section of society. To implement this aspect of the class struggle, Lenin pointed out, it was necessary to rely on the village poor and the urban proletariat to prevent the middle peasant in villages and the petty-bourgeois in towns from gravitating towards counter-revolution. The use of bourgeois experts (see above) was another new and indispensable aspect of the class struggle. Finally, of crucial importance to the proletariat's struggle at this time was the implementation of a new labour discipline, a discipline of the united working masses, a conscious discipline characterised by mutual responsibility, and one which was to replace the feudal discipline of the stick and the capitalist discipline of hunger.

The general objective of the class struggle at the stage of building socialism, Lenin said, was to overcome all forms of resistance on the part of the old society, not just in the political sphere but also in economics and, most important and difficult of all, in consciousness.

Lenin also studied the specific development of the socialist state in the first few years of Soviet power. He revealed that the strength of this state lay in the consciousness of the masses, in the ideological cohesion between the workers and the working peasants. In his books, speeches and addresses on the issue of the state, he formulated major tasks facing the state of a new type. First, it was to defend the revolutionary gains and to exclude the possibility for

the crushed exploiter classes to recapture power. Second, the working people's state had to establish the unity of the labouring masses by rallying them around the Communist Party, the guilding force in the new society. Third, the proletarian state had to neutralise the petty-bourgeois element prevailing among the small owners in town and country. The accomplishment of these tasks became the basis for the Soviet state's subsequent activities and made it possible to achieve the general objective of laying the foundations for a socialist society in the Soviet Union.

In the early 1920s Lenin made another contribution to the idea that socialism could initially triumph in one country. He showed that building a socialist system was a threesome task. The first, and most important of all the three, was to create the material and technical basis for socialism. Outlining the means for solving this problem, Lenin pointed out that all the other development stages should be preceded by the electrification of the country, for this would make it possible to set up a strong industrial base for socialism. It was at this time that Lenin coined his famous phrase: "Communism is Soviet power plus the electrification of the whole country." [10] The second stage in building socialism was the collectivisation of agriculture. The plan widely known as Lenin's Cooperation Plan contemplated a changeover from multi-structural, isolated, backward peasant economies to large-scale cooperatives, based on socialist principles and applying modern machines, advanced cultivation technique and the latest scientific discoveries. The third, and final, stage was a cultural revolution, which would result in creating a new technical intelligentsia from among the best workers and peasants, as well as a higher level of skills and ideological awareness among the major labouring classes in the Soviet Republic.

The second aspect of the threesome general objective, Lenin emphasised, consisted in shaping new, socialist relations in society, and first of all, material production relations. This economic problem, he said, was closely connected with that of establishing a new material and technical basis. It "can be assured only when the Russian proletarian state effectively controls a huge industrial machine built on up-to-date technology". [11] To accomplish this task, two conditions are indispensable: the organisation of

a country-wide accounting system and control over production and distribution, and consistent work to raise labour productivity. To achieve the former condition, it was necessary to introduce conscientious discipline among the working people, while the latter condition hinged on the organisation of socialist emulation as a most essential method of effecting socialist economic management and encouraging creative initiative among the working people. In *A Great Beginning* Lenin described the emergence of a new, communist attitude to work, an attitude which had shown itself at the communist *subbotniks* [12] and which revealed the meaning of socialist emulation as an expression of the cohesion and mutual help of the shock workers, their readiness to follow the best examples, in the new conditions of socialised production.

Yet establishing new social relations did not involve the production sphere alone. It was necessary to shape and develop the entire mechanism of social relations, including political, legal and ethical. This implied primarily establishing a new, proletarian democracy, unprecedented in history. In his article, "A Contribution to the History of the Question of the Dictatorship", and in other works, Lenin disclosed the essence of the dictatorship of the proletariat as coercion with regard to the remnants of the overthrown classes and, at the same time, as the highest form of democracy for the overwhelming majority of society—the working masses.

The third aspect of the threesome general objective of socialist construction, according to Lenin, was the revolutionary transformation of social consciousness, of the entire system of science and culture, and the provision of conditions in which a socialist consciousness would be instilled in the mind of every Soviet man. To fulfil this task in the conditions of age-old backwardness inherited by the Soviet state from tsarism, it was necessary first of all to eliminate illiteracy and set up public education centres. The Party, with Lenin at its head, began promoting the activity of scientific and cultural institutions and art centres as early as 1918, so that by the mid-1920s a ramified network of research, educational and cultural establishments sprang up all over the country. By the end of the first decade of Soviet power, great changes had taken place in Soviet science and culture, as well as in train-

ing skilled and high-principled experts for all sectors of the national economy. Now the Party and the state based their policy on the formula: "Cadres are everything".

In formulating this threesome task of socialist construction Lenin in fact revealed the fundamental objective laws governing the transition from capitalism to communism.

He also dealt with uniform and specific features of building socialism in various countries. Soviet power was the first, and a historically new type of dictatorship of the proletariat, a dictatorship which succeeded not only in crushing capitalism but also in building socialism in the USSR. Lenin, however, repeatedly pointed out, even in the first years of Soviet rule, that the Soviet dictatorship of the proletariat was not to become an absolute, that it was not the only type of proletarian state possible. In his *The State and Revolution,* written before the October Revolution, Lenin carried out a far-reaching analysis of Marx and Engels' ideas on the Paris Commune-type state, which was the first attempt to establish a state of proletarian dictatorship. After the October Revolution he showed that the Soviets were the most suitable type of worker-and-peasant state for Russia.

At the same time, he emphasised that in other countries different forms of working-class power were possible. Analysing the revolutionary action of the British proletariat, Lenin wrote that the Shop Stewards' Committees which emerged and operated there in the early 1920s could become the germ of a new type of proletarian state.

Lenin reiterated that the dictatorship of the proletariat could be accomplished in a traditional parliamentary form if Parliament underwent a cardinal change, i.e. if the majority of its members voiced the interests of the working class. He pointed out that Parliament was the product of a given country's historical development and should not in certain circumstances be discarded. A thorough analysis should be carried out in each particular case. "Right doctrinairism persisted in recognising only the old forms, and became utterly bankrupt, for it did not notice the new content. Left doctrinairism persists in the unconditional repudiation of certain old forms, failing to see that the new content is forcing its way through all and sundry

forms".[13] A scientific approach, meanwhile, suggests entirely different principles. "Science demands, first, that the experience of other countries be taken into account . . ., second, it demands that account be taken of *all* the forces, groups, parties, classes and masses operating in a given country."[14] Only this kind of approach can help find the most expedient forms of the struggle for a new society and can make this struggle successful.

Working on the issues of international social evolution, Lenin advanced, in the post-October years, his teaching on imperialism as the last stage of capitalism. In particular, he examined the prospects of the revolutionary liberation movements in the colonies and dependent countries after the world war, and proved that the collapse of the world colonial system was historically inevitable. He also investigated and substantiated in principle the possibility of certain countries achieving socialism without going through the capitalist stage of development. This brilliant prophecy was fully borne out by the experience of the Soviet Central Asian Republics, and of the Mongolian People's Republic.

Lenin devoted much space in his post-October works to shaping a new, communist consciousness of people in countries in which the socialist revolution has triumphed. He mostly generalised from the experience of the Soviet state, of course. But, as 20th-century history has proved, his ideas and conclusions have been corroborated in many socialist countries.

The structure and content of communist consciousness, as Lenin showed, greatly broadened after the victorious socialist revolution. In the first few years of Soviet power Lenin formulated fundamental propositions on the content of communist consciousness and ways to shape it among the broad masses of workers and working peasants. In his speech at the Third Congress of the Young Communist League, Lenin said: "You can become a Communist only when you enrich your mind with a knowledge of all the treasures created by mankind."[15] And he went on to explain what he meant, touching upon certain practical problems in building socialism. "Communist society, as we know, cannot be built unless we restore industry and agriculture, and that, not in the old way. They must be reestablished on a modern basis, in accordance with the last

word in science. You know that electricity is that basis .... You realise perfectly well that illiterate people cannot tackle electrification, and that elementary literacy is not enough either."[16] Lenin pointed out that studying communism after the victorious socialist revolution meant including all the achievements of science and technology in the science of communism.

In this way, not only the social and political theory of transition from capitalism to communism, but the sum-total of knowledge produced by the natural sciences and technology, needed to realise these social and political ideas, are included in the structure of communist consciousness at this stage.

The State Plan for Electrification of Russia (GOELRO) conceived on Lenin's initiative in the early 1920s is a perfect example. In Lenin's words, the GOELRO plan was "not a technical one ... but a political or state plan, i.e. a task for the proletariat".[17] He laid special stress on the fact that the plan's greatest significance consisted in its combining the achievements of science and technology with socio-political and economic opportunities and the principles of socialist construction. Lenin cited the work of Karl Ballood, a German scientist who compiled a plan for restructuring the German economy along socialist lines and said that in Germany, "being a capitalist country, the plan never got off the ground. It remains a lone-wolf effort, and an exercise in literary composition."[18] In Soviet Russia, on the contrary, hundreds of experts specialising in different subjects were involved in the GOELRO plan. As a result, they presented a plan based on the latest advances in natural science, technology and the social sciences. Moreover, they carried out tremendous educational and ideological work among the workers and peasants, arming them with the scientific knowledge of the prospects offered by socialist construction in the USSR. They also proved that carrying out the GOELRO plan, "based on the Soviet system will mean the complete success of the foundations of communism in our country—foundations of a cultured life, without exploiters".[19] Lenin disclosed the social significance of the plan, setting it the task "that every factory and every electric power station [become] a centre of enlightenment; if Russia is covered with a dense network of electric power stations and powerful technical installations, our

communist economic development will become a model for a future socialist Europe and Asia." [20]

To achieve this target, Lenin pointed out, a general and coordinated plan was needed, which should include "focussing the people's attention and energies. Raising culture (of the working people). Not simple literacy". [21] Becoming a conscientious fighter for socialism, Lenin wrote elsewhere, means "becoming a skilled man . . . *but with this addition, however,* that this 'craftsman' should have *a broad general education . . .; should be a Communist . . .; should have a polytechnical outlook and the foundations (beginnings) of polytechnical education*". [22]

The subsequent plans for developing the Soviet economy, as well as similar plans adopted and implemented by the fraternal socialist countries, have an economic and socio-political, rather than a narrow production, content and significance. The unity of the scientific, class, party, socio-political and ideological aspects of their content makes them a genuine expression of the social consciousness of socialist society, based on the unity of knowledge, convictions and activity among the broad working masses.

Lenin's ideas are exceptionally relevant to determining the structure and content of the communist consciousness of the working people in a developed socialist society, as well as the place and role apportioned in this consciousness to scientific and communist, general philosophical, economic, political, natural science, technical and humanitarian knowledge, to ethical and aesthetic views, ideals and norms.

In this connection Lenin drew attention to Marx's assessment of ideological life in the Paris Commune in 1871. Marx wrote: "There was, of course, no time to reorganise public instruction (education); but by removing the religious and clerical element from it, the Commune has taken the initiative in the mental emancipation of the people." [23] And further on: "Only the working class can emancipate them [society—*L.S.*] . . . from priest rule, convert science from an instrument of class rule into a popular force, convert the men of science themselves from panderers to class prejudice, place-hunting state parasites, and allies of capital into free agents of thought! Science can only play its genuine part in the Republic of Labour." [24]

The Paris Commune, however, was weakened by ideo-

logical differences among its leaders and by the absence of a concerted ideological, and consequently political, line in the struggle against the reactionaries.

Lenin came to similar conclusions when he analysed the Russian revolution of 1905-07. This is why, after the revolution was defeated, he launched a vigorous campaign for the ideological unity of the working-class movement and for creating a clearly-defined philosophical foundation for the Party of a new type.

During the preparations for and during the Great October Socialist Revolution, as well as during the ensuing Civil War, Lenin worked on the problems of educating the proletarian and peasant masses in ideological and political terms, considering this one of the major aspects of Party work.

One of the most harmful doctrines of international opportunism put forward on the eve of the October Revolution, maintained that the proletariat was not yet ready for a socialist revolution because of its cultural backwardness and the lack of trained leaders in its ranks capable of guiding either the revolution itself or the socialist construction that would follow. This doctrine led the Russian Mensheviks, for example, to conclude that the Russian revolution should be led by the bourgeoisie, with the working people playing a secondary role.

In 1922, N. Sukhanov (A. N. Gimmer), a prominent Russian Menshevik, published his "Notes on the Revolution" in Berlin, in which he asserted that the "development of the productive forces of Russia has not attained the level that makes socialism possible", that to build socialism, the class that would assume leadership of society should possess a definite level of culture and knowledge. Lenin replied to Sukhanov in his famous article, "Our Revolution", in which he wrote, with regard to the communist consciousness and cultural standards of the working class leading the 1917 Revolution: "If a definite level of culture is required for the building of socialism ... why cannot we begin by first achieving the prerequisites for that definite level of culture in a revolutionary way, and *then*, with the aid of the workers' and peasants' government and the Soviet system, proceed to overtake the other nations?" [25]

In 1922, Lenin's work "On the Significance of Militant

Materialism" was published in the first Marxist philosophical magazine *Pod znamenem marxizma* (Under the Banner of Marxism). This work is in fact Lenin's philosophical legacy, for it contains a far-reaching analysis of the tasks confronting Marxist philosophy after the victorious socialist revolution and outlines its major directions and objectives.

As far back as 1920, at the Second Congress of the Communist International, Lenin warned the Communists against sectarianism and attempts to form an exclusive circle, separated from non-Communists by an insurmountable wall. In his philosophical legacy he developed this thesis, now with respect to philosophy: "One of the biggest and most dangerous mistakes made by Communists (as generally by revolutionaries who have successfully accomplished the beginning of a great revolution) is the idea that a revolution can be made by revolutionaries alone.... Without an alliance with non-Communists in the most diverse spheres of activity there can be no question of any successful communist construction." [26] In the sphere of philosophy, Lenin pointed out, it was necessary to make use of all the most progressive achievements attained in the past, in particular, the solid materialist tradition inherent in the development of world philosophical thinking. He commended French 18th-century materialism and 19th-century revolutionary-democratic materialist thought in Russia. All progressive scientists, even if they had not joined the Communist Party, should be enlisted to work on problems of philosophy.

A firm alliance should be formed between Marxist philosophers and advanced natural scientists, because "no natural science and no materialism can hold its own in the struggle against the onslaught of bourgeois ideas and the restoration of the bourgeois world outlook unless it stands on solid philosophical ground." [27]

Lenin also emphasised that a comprehensive development of the Marxist theory of materialist dialectics was indispensable. To carry out fundamental research into the problems of dialectics, he thought, it was necessary to combine two directions: first, Hegel's dialectics should be critically applied, after reconsidering and assimilating it from the Marxist materialist standpoint; second, the specific practical experience of the dialectics of social develop-

ment, both in the Soviet Union and worldwide should be analysed. Being a dialectical materialist in the 20th century, Lenin wrote, means first of all being able to investigate specific phenomena from dialectical positions, and making use of "examples of dialectics in the sphere of economic and political relations, which recent history, especially modern imperialist war and revolution, provides in unusual abundance". [28]

A ruthless and uncompromising struggle against all reactionary trends in philosophy, be they idealist, metaphysical or religious theories, is the most important policy task in Marxist philosophy. This task, Lenin stressed, is one of "unflinchingly exposing and indicating all modern 'graduated flunkeys of clericalism', irrespective of whether they act as representatives of official science or as free lances calling themselves 'democratic Left or ideologically socialist' publicists". [29] These recommendations of Lenin's laid the groundwork for all the subsequent criticism of bourgeois philosophy and revisionism in all spheres of the ideological struggle after the October Revolution.

Lenin's programme for developing Marxist philosophy, as outlined in his work "On the Significance of Militant Materialism", was of vital importance to the future history of Marxist-Leninist philosophy. On the basis of this the Party launched a gigantic campaign to establish a ramified system of philosophical research, educational work and philosophical propaganda in the Soviet Union.

In 1918, the Socialist Academy of Social Sciences was set up on Lenin's initiative to organise theoretical research in the main branches of social knowledge. In 1919, the newly-formed Sverdlov Communist University was set the task of training skilled workers, well-versed in theory, for Party and government work, as well as for research in the social sciences. In the early 1920s, the Russian Association of Social Science Institutes was formed, including within it the Institute of Philosophical Science. The Institute of Red Professors, which trained high-echelon workers in philosophy and the social sciences, also emerged at this time. The Marxist philosophical magazine *Pod znamenem marxizma* published since 1922, carried articles on problems of philosophy, history and political economy. The Socialist Academy also put out a periodical, *Vestnik sotsialisticheskoi* (since 1924—*kommunisticheskoi*) *Akademii*

(News of the Socialist [since 1924—Communist] Academy), which played an important role in the philosophical discussions of the 1920s.

A major role in working out problems of philosophy was played at this stage by the Social Sciences Faculty (with a special Philosophy Section), organised at the Krupskaya Communist Education Academy, by the philosophy department at Moscow University's Ethnology Department, and similar departments at the universities of Petrograd, Saratov, Kazan and several other towns.

In 1917-1924, they were all engaged in working out the syllabus and programme for educational and research work in philosophy, based on the ideas Lenin formulated in his articles and speeches, such as "The Tasks of the Youth Leagues", at the Third YCL Congress, reports at various conferences and meetings on public education, in his note "On Proletarian Culture", as well as in "Once More on the Trade-Unions, the Current Situation and the Mistakes of Trotsky and Bukharin", "On the Significance of Militant Materialism", "Pages from a Diary", "Our Revolution" and other works.

The struggle for Marxism, the ideology of the new social system, was the general purpose of all this activity. At the time of the victorious October Revolution, philosophical thought in Russia presented a rather motley picture. Philosophy chairs at universities were filled with people adhering to all kinds of idealistic trends—intuitionism, Machism, neo-Kantianism, etc. A whole range of philosophical societies and periodicals existed, also of a pronouncedly idealistic nature. The Party, for its part, had not yet formed a sufficient force of well-trained workers in science and education, for its best-educated members were fighting in the Civil War and were engaged in rehabilitating the devastated economy and in Party and government work.

This was why, in the first few years of Soviet power, idealist philosophers launched several attempts to take command positions in the ideological life of the country. In Petrograd, for example, the Petrograd Philosophy Society was active, led by N. Lossky and L. Karsavin, and another idealist society, the Free Philosophy Association, was set up in 1918 with A. Bely at its head. In Moscow, N. Berdyaev founded the Free Religious-Philosophical Academy while an idealist Psychology Society, led by

L. Lopatin, continued its activities at the Moscow University. Similar organisations were active in other university cities in Soviet Russia, such as Rostov-on-Don, Yaroslavl, Kazan, etc. Idealist philosophers tried to maintain their influence over the press, too. In Petrograd, in the early 1920s, an idealist philosophical magazine *Mysl* (Thought) resumed publication, while in Moscow a philosophical yearbook, *Mysl i Slovo* (Thought and Word), appeared. A number of private publishing houses sprang up, providing a vast supply of books by idealist philosophers, the *Smena Vekh* people, [30] etc.

Meanwhile, many petty-bourgeois philosophers, preaching the ideas of the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries defeated by the revolution, also stepped up their ideological activities. A. Bogdanov, for example, whose idealistic concepts Lenin had exposed in 1908 in his *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism,* now came out with his theory of "tectology", or a "general organisational science", in which he expressed his own concept of proletarian culture, denying the importance for the working class of the cultural values of the past. Bogdanov headed Proletkult—a large organisation with a ramified network of local branches, arts studios and educational establishments that claimed ideological leadership in the education of young workers. Menshevik, socialist-revolutionary and anarchist theoreticians also claimed leading positions in Soviet social thinking.

Such was the background against which the Party, led by Lenin, was busy creating a unified system of Marxist education in the country's academic institutions and of research in the social sciences. Idealist and petty-bourgeois ideologists were subjected to devastating criticism in heated debates and those in university chairs and doing educational work were replaced by Marxists-Bolsheviks.

To sum up, in the period between 1917 and 1924 (i.e., during the Civil War and economic rehabilitation) the Bolsheviks, led by Lenin, established a unified system of Marxist education, of training Party workers well grounded in the social sciences and launched fundamental research in Marxist philosophy. During this, the first philosophy textbooks were compiled and the general content of dialectical materialist philosophy was revealed as a science. In this struggle for Marxism as the dominant ideology

of the new society, the Party, with Lenin at its head, scored a decisive victory over those who supported non-Marxist ideological trends.

2. Lenin on the Scientific Management of Society

Lenin contributed greatly to the analysis of the philosophical and methodological problems of social management. Before the October Revolution, when he worked on the doctrine of the Party of a new type, Lenin pointed out that "no revolutionary movement can endure without a stable organisation of leaders maintaining continuity".[31] And to establish such an organisation a scientific approach, in-depth study and use of all the knowledge accumulated by humankind are indispensable. "What does communism consist in? All propaganda for communism must be conducted in a way that will amount to practical guidance of the state's development."[32] And management, administration is a science, "it is a question of skill, a question of experience".[33] It is impossible to administer without competence, without profound knowledge, without mastering the science of management, Lenin said, and he concluded that the Communists must "study and study hard in institutes for the higher organisation of labour".[34]

On Lenin's initiative, special scientific institutions were set up to study the problems of social management. These became the object of serious study by many research workers. They were also reflected and analysed in Soviet state and Party documents, as well as in the works and speeches by many of Lenin's outstanding associates and disciples.

Marxist-Leninist ideas on social management have been materialised in building communism in the USSR, and in creating and further developing a system for the science-based guidance of society in the entire socialist community. Yet there is no justification for thinking that the victory of socialism is sufficient for such a system to emerge: like any other social process, it is a historical phenomenon. A victorious socialist revolution only creates conditions in which a scientific system of social management

can be established. In the transitional period between capitalism and socialism, socialist administration acquires a number of specific features which brings it closer to science and makes it possible to take advantage of its latest advances. These are, first, the fundamental ideas of Marxist-Leninist theory, the ideas which underlie socialist statehood and the entire process of social management. Second, the ties between practical management and the development of fundamental and applied sciences grow stronger, providing a foundation for fulfilling social tasks. Third, a number of sociological surveys are carried out to draw on the practical experience of establishing a new social system, which is indispensable for applying theory in practical state administration. Scientific management, however, cannot be considered an established fact at this stage, because of numerous failures and errors of a subjectivist, voluntarist nature which, alongside great successes, are still in evidence.

The use of Marxist-Leninist theory in the process of building and developing socialism and the conclusions drawn from experience gained in these practical activities amount to what can be described as a system of scientific management. Yet the process cannot be considered consummate because, as society continues to advance along the road to communism, so also does the accumulation of administrative experience, its generalisation and the bringing out of new phenomena, aspects and characteristics of this process. Thus, the development of scientific management is a continuous process.

In September 1917, i.e. on the eve of the October Revolution, Lenin wrote his famous "Marxism and Insurrection", in which he formulated the main tasks facing the Bolshevik Party in the forthcoming armed uprising. He wrote: "In order to treat insurrection in a Marxist way, i.e., as an art, we must..., without losing a single moment, organise a *headquarters* of the insurgent detachments, distribute our forces, move the reliable regiments to the most important points ... arrest the General Staff and the government... (which would rather die than allow the enemy to approach the strategic points of the city). We must mobilise the armed workers ... occupy the telegraph and the telephone exchange at once...".[35] Lenin is in fact saying here that insurrection is the art of estab-

lishing the leadership for an insurrection, of assessing and distributing forces and establishing control over the most important institutions, checking the enemy forces and using communications and the mass media. His conclusions are based on an analysis of the experience in tackling similar tasks at the preceding stages of the revolution. It is just this, Lenin says, that expresses the view of the guidance of an insurrection as an art. And this leads to the broader conclusion that social management, being an art, implies the ability and capacity of the leaders to sum up and apply the past experience of similar activities.

But the art of carrying out such activities is not synonymous to a scientific approach, for science does not just sum up previous experience. So-called precedents are widely used by social administrations in pre-socialist systems. For example, British law is based entirely on precedent, i.e. judgements are made in accordance with the judgements passed in previous similar cases. Moreover, the authoritative body usually abstracts from the specific circumstances under which such a judgement, and no other, was made earlier. Here, the very fact of a precedent having taken place is crucial. Yet, this has nothing to do with a scientific approach, which, rather than being a simple statement of the preceding experience, implies that an assessment of previous experience from the point of view of the objective laws governing social development is the main thing. The only criterion underlying a scientific approach to tackling social tasks is whether a given process accords with these laws or contradicts them.

The first basic element of the process of social management is to determine its purpose. By purpose Marx meant an ideal, inner motive of man's actions.[36] Lenin regarded purpose as the formulation of man's needs in the light of the objective laws governing the world. "The laws of the external world, of nature . . . are the bases of man's *purposive* activity,"[37] he wrote; "men's ends are engendered by the objective world and presuppose it . . . . But it *seems* to man as if his ends are taken from outside the world, and are independent of the world ('freedom')."[38] Hence the Marxist-Leninist concept of purpose means understanding by a person or a community of people of the necessity to change the world in a definite way

in accordance with their own needs, interests and knowledge as perceived at the given moment.

Marxist philosophy, economic theory and scientific communism as a whole determine the purposes of human activity in general and of social management in particular. Consequently, Marxist theory is an ideological and methodological basis for determining the purposes of administration. This only becomes possible under socialism, when Marxist theory prevails.

Achieving a purpose presupposes the existence of means to bring it about. Pre-Marxist social thinking professed the principle: "The end justifies the means." [39] The destructive wars and violence used by the exploiters to achieve their selfish ends are the most striking manifestations of this principle in pre-socialist types of administration, while fascism is its extreme, most reactionary and inhumane expression.

Marxism tied in the means and the freedom of achieving the aim. Engels defined freedom as recognised necessity, i.e. the "capacity to make decisions with knowledge of the subject". [40] And knowledge of the subject presupposes looking for a means to achieve the set aim, which corresponds to objective historical laws. This was pointed out by Hegel who said that the means are tools which people use in their activities and by which they exercise their power over external nature. In pursuing their aims, therefore, people are dependent on the external world (its laws), whereas in choosing the means and ways to achieve these purposes they resort to those which are the most convenient and correspond not only to the external laws but also to their own needs.

In a socialist society the choice of means to achieve the set aims is neither secondary nor arbitrary—it is determined by the objective laws governing socialist development.

Or, to put it the other way round: if the means of achieving the aims contradict the laws of socialist development and the requirements of the majority of the population, they remain abstract ideas, no matter how loudly they are proclaimed.

Lenin showed that, in determining the means to achieve the aims, Marxist-Leninist theory proceeds from the fundamental laws of social development, one of them be-

ing recognition of the decisive role of the popular masses in social development. It follows, then, that Marxism-Leninism firmly links the choice of means to achieve the aims with the activities of the masses, raising their social enthusiasm, initiative and creative spirit. And this means that, to achieve their main purpose—building communism—as well as all the other, more limited tasks subordinate to the main one, the Communists must look for the most humane means, as determined by the basic economic law of socialism—the maximum satisfaction of the working people's material and cultural needs.

Bourgeois social science has produced many concepts in the scientific organisation of labour since the beginning of the 20th century, for instance, Taylor's system and various concepts on scientific management techniques, diverse theories of determining optimal forms of organising production. But not one was linked to the general concept of social development. They mostly dealt with problems of production organisation within the framework of a single enterprise, firm or association. Marxists-Leninists established, for the first time in the history of human thinking, a firm link between the organisation of labour and the objective laws of social development. The ideas Marx and Lenin formulated with respect to the principles and laws of human activity are, therefore, a concrete expression of the general laws of social development.

Lenin emphasised that in organising human activities, rallying the working people closer together, and enhancing their creative energy, taking into account and applying theoretical knowledge is vitally important in managing socialist society scientifically.

His ideas on social management are based on taking into account and using the unity of economic, socio-political and ideological processes underway in society, and recognising the primary, determining role of economic laws as the backbone of the social process. Scientific management in a developed socialist society, as seen from the angle of these ideas, is a type of social relations that combines economic, socio-political and ideological aspects and stems from the unity of knowledge, assessments and activities manifested in each concrete measure employed in the social management of the new society.

The CPSU Central Committee Resolution "On Further Improving the Economic Mechanism and on the Tasks Facing the Party and State Bodies", as well as the Resolution "On Improving the Planning Methods and Enhancing the Impact of the Economic Mechanism on Production Efficiency and Work Quality", adopted by the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers in July 1979, lay special emphasis on the unity of economic, social and ideological management in a developed socialist society, and prove that the inseverable link existing between the practice and the theory of social management is a salient feature of developed socialism.

Whatever the social stage or development level, social management has two distinctive aspects: the objective—that which exists outside and independently of man's consciousness, and the subjective—that which is linked with man's consciousness, and its activities in the spheres of cognition, evaluation, emotion and will-power.

Lenin said that society, in all its unity and diversity, as a "living organism in a state of constant development" [41] is an object of management. Examining pre-socialist systems, Lenin noted that labouring humankind "have hitherto stood beyond the pale of history, and have been regarded merely as the object of history". But he stressed that "world imperialism shall fall when the revolutionary onslaught of the exploited and oppressed workers in each country, overcoming resistance from petty-bourgeois elements and the influence of the small upper crust of labour aristocrats, merges with the revolutionary onslaught of hundreds of millions of people". [42] Thus, the historical trend in the development of the object of human activity (and in its management) leads to a merger of object and subject and to all the working masses becoming the creative subject of history and of their own lives, the creative subject of the scientific management of their destinies. And only socialism offers conditions for such a merger.

Lenin distinguished three stages in the formation of the subject of history. The first is that at which man, while still a savage, cannot separate himself from the environment and, unaware of his place in nature, has to adapt himself to the environment and use only those means and conditions which already exist. The second stage is a class pre-socialist society: the people, the working classes,

are already aware of the place they occupy in the surrounding world and of their own immediate needs, but cannot yet define and substantiate theoretically the genuine aims of social development. At this stage the subject of history and the subject of management part ways: the activities of the popular masses remain the main subject of history while the dominant, exploiter classes and institutions set up by them, such as the state, the church, political parties, etc., become the subject of management. The relations between these two subjects are of an antagonistic nature.

These relations undergo a radical change under socialism. The two subjects practically merge into one in the course of socialist construction and particularly at the stage of developed socialism, testifying to the growing economic, socio-political and ideological cohesion of the new social system. Today, the subject of social management in a developed socialist society are special groups of people (the Soviets of People's Deputies and the bodies they set up), elected to decide on the purposes, means, methods and tasks of the activity of the masses. The steadily growing rapprochement between the subject of management, on the one hand, and the masses, with their conscious and creative activity in communist construction, on the other, is a historical trend of socialism.

The relationship between and the active role of objective and subjective conditions in social development and its scientific management occupy an important place in the dialectics of the objective and the subjective in socialist administration. When speaking of the objective conditions of social life and management, Marxists-Leninists mean first of all the material conditions of social life, i.e. the natural environment (including geographical, meteorological and atmospheric conditions, mineral and water resources); the population (its size, dynamics, structure, birth and death rates, etc.); and the mode of production of material goods. As socialism develops, the problem of the environment and population moves to the foreground. Yet it is the mode of production that remains, and will always remain, a decisive feature of human society, determining the general course of its development at each particular stage.

The objective conditions also include (and this acquires

special importance under socialism) the aggregate relations between people outside the structure of material, economic relations. These are primarily social relations involving the superstructure, i.e. political, legal, etc. All social institutions and establishments existing to cater to the needs of the working people in such spheres as education, information, social contacts and everyday life also belong to the system of objective conditions.

The subjective social conditions and their management are the level of people's consciousness, the extent to which they are united and organised, as well as their ability to implement their knowledge and experience in practice. Lenin points out four basic elements which essentially express the subjective conditions. The first is sufficient cohesion between the subject of social management and the object it directs. The second is the moral and political trust of the masses in the subject of management. The third is the correspondence between words and deeds, convictions and actions, on the part of both the leaders and those led by them. And finally, the fourth is a clearly delineated, well-substantiated action programme brought to the consciousness of the broad population.

Under capitalism and other pre-socialist systems, the subjective conditions of social development are profoundly antagonistic, for they include such cardinally opposite phenomena as the consciousness and the organisation of hostile classes. Socialism abolishes this contradiction, combining the subjective conditions of its development with scientific management against a background of deep inner unity between the working people and the subject of management they themselves nominated.

The historical trend of socialism consists not only in a rapprochement between objective and subjective conditions, but also in the growing impact of the subjective conditions on the general evolution of society towards communism. The higher the masses' consciousness, their organisation and capacity for action, the nearer society is to achieving the highest stage of communism.

Objective and subjective social conditions and their scientific management at the socialist stage are manifestations of the inner motive forces behind social processes; by mastering these people acquire an ability to accelerate

and diversify their onward development, while securing ever new victories.

The dialectic of the objective and the subjective in management includes another vital factor—the leader's willpower, his gift for rallying and directing the masses towards achieving the set tasks. Of special significance is his ability, on the one hand, to concentrate on the main thing, the determinant, in his work and, on the other, not to overlook the "trifles", which, more often than not, prove to be of far greater importance than it seems at first glance.

This is how Lenin put it: "It is not enough to be a revolutionary and an adherent of socialism or a Communist in general. You must be able at each particular moment to find the particular link in the chain which you must grasp with all your might in order to hold the whole chain and to prepare firmly for the transition to the next link; the order of the links, their form, the manner in which they are linked together, the way they differ from each other in the historical chain of events, are not as simple and not as meaningless as those in an ordinary chain made by a smith."[43] This is in fact an action programme for taking a scientific approach to managing the new society.

As we compare Lenin's propositions with the ideas, currently in use, of network planning and management, of the target-programme approach and systems analysis widely applied in management today, it strikes the eye that Lenin had demonstrated the essence of social management, its internal factors, structure, links, and causal relationships, as far back as 1918, i.e. long before a special methodology had been devised.

The significance of Lenin's ideas is also borne out by the fact that he demonstrated the need for a balance in managing the large issues and the "trifles". The practice of socialist management shows that a science-based approach to managerial matters in a socialist society excludes both extremes—an infatuation with large-scale problems to the detriment of current matters, and overlooking the general targets while concentrating on immediate, everyday assignments. If a leader relegates current matters to his subordinates, this may result in his losing contact with the staff, and red tape; on the other hand, if he tries personally to control every trifle, this will cause him to lose

sight of perspective, impair his business contacts with subordinates and will finally lead to serious failures and blunders. Therefore, clarity of purpose and consistency in management imply the vital principle: in tackling questions of even minute scope, one should not lose sight of the general target, and at the same time should skilfully combine the current interests and needs of the staff with this general target.

Lenin particularly stressed the importance of correct relations between leaders and their subordinates. "The circumstance may appear to be a negligible detail. But ... it is not a detail, or it is a detail which can assume decisive importance." [44] While building socialism and communism, Lenin said, relations among leaders, and between leaders and their subordinates, should be balanced, comradely and considerate, and at the same time exacting and business-like.

The CPSU and the Soviet Government pay particular attention to a leader's awareness of the new, and his ability to identify and encourage the most progressive and promising lines of social development. A scientific approach to the method of identifying the new in the infinite diversity of outside phenomena is particularly important.

In the course of his or her life and education, each person forms his or her own perception filters which allow him or her to single out and understand the habitual and vital signals among an endless number of outside irritations acting on his or her mind. These filters are absolutely necessary for selecting among the external signals those indispensable at the particular moment. But this has its dark side, too, because a person gradually learns "not to hear" anything beyond the framework of his or her everyday life, anything which is unusual. The perception filters are most pliant and changeable in young people, while in mature persons and especially in the aged, these filters more often than not interfere with their perception and appreciation of anything new.

People engaged in managerial activities also possess such filters. As their work is particularly important to society, they must constantly train their filters to be flexible and adaptable if they wish to approach managerial matters in a scientific way. Lenin had an acute sense of the new and trained his followers and colleagues to develop

it. Today, the Communist Party constantly draws the attention of its rank and file to the need of active training in this respect, for there cannot be scientific management without the ability to discern the new, to understand and support it.

Lenin pointed out that today "the task of administering the state . . has this special feature that, probably for the first time in the modern history of civilised nations it deals pre-eminently with economics rather than with politics".[45] In pre-socialist societies the concept of administration was understood mostly as political activity, because production management was in the hands of private owners and ideological life was governed by various non-government bodies, such as the church, private societies and ideological centres (the press, educational and cultural institutions, etc.) and, somewhat later, by the political parties of the dominant classes.

The state in class-antagonistic societies has practically no say in economic and ideological development and only has an apparatus for political coercion at its disposal (the army, police force, courts of law, etc.). Social management, understandably, was not a unified process governed by a single power body in the economy, politics and ideology, i.e. in all the three basic spheres of social life.

Socialist management rests on entirely different principles. Engels characterised the unity and specifics of the working-class parties' struggle to achieve a socialist revolution as a combination of economic, political and theoretical struggles.[46] Lenin creatively developed Marxist theory in accordance with the tasks confronting the working-class movement in the 20th century and paid particular attention to Engels' thesis, while emphasising the indissoluble link between the basic forms of the class struggle of the proletariat: in economics, politics and ideology.

After the victorious socialist revolution the unity of all aspects of social development demanded a solution to the problems of coordinating the management of the economy, political matters and the ideological and cultural evolution of the new society. All these problems were largely dealt with in Lenin's works.

Speaking of the need for the new state to organically combine the three basic functions (economic, political and ideological) of social management, Lenin proved that eco-

nomic decisions cannot be valid outside their political and ideological implications; that political resolutions are void outside their impact on the economic, ideological and cultural life of society, while every decision in the sphere of ideology and culture has a direct bearing on the economic and political spheres of social development.

The economy and the governing of its development are decisive in the social process; on the basis of the economy everything else is formed. "Politics," Lenin said, "is a concentrated expression of economics." Moreover, in the new society, "politics must take precedence over economics". [47] This means that, while it results from certain economic conditions, politics can exert an active feedback effect on economics.

The state in socialist society unites, for the first time in history, economic and political administration with the management of the education of the population and the guidance of the entire ideological sphere of social life. This function exercised by the ministries and departments responsible for general, secondary, and higher specialised education, cultural matters, the mass media, etc., is directly guided by the Communist Party. The purpose of this activity is "to educate the working people in the spirit of high ideological principles and devotion to the socialist homeland and the cause of communism, in the spirit of a communist attitude to labour and public property, and completely to eradicate vestiges of bourgeois views and morals, while harmoniously developing the individual and creating a true wealth of spiritual culture". [48]

The unity of these aspects forms the contents of the scientific management of developed socialist society. The problem of a comprehensive approach to tackling social tasks was posed and analysed by Marx and Engels in their theory of scientific communism, Lenin also contributed greatly. To attain the true knowledge of an object, he pointed out, it is necessary to look at and examine all its facets, its connections, to take it in development, in self-movement, include the whole of human experience, concrete practice. [49] "We must constantly test ourselves by a study of the chain of political events in their entirety, in their causal connection, in their results. By analysing the errors of yesterday, we learn to avoid errors today and tomorrow." [50] Lenin's ideas on the theory of so-

cial management serve as the basis for the entire theoretical and practical work of the Communist Party and the Soviet state in determining how the scientific management of the new society shall develop.

3. Philosophical Discussions of the 1920s

In 1917-1924, while fighting to make Marxism the dominant ideology of the new society, the Party repeatedly came out against the attempts of bourgeois and revisionist philosophers to distort and falsify the philosophical essence of Marx and Engels' teaching. These attempts became more persistent after Lenin died (January 1924). In this period, the ideological struggle was waged not only against Marxism as in 1918-1920, but largely against the basic tenets of Leninism, against the theoretical content of its ideas and their practical implementation. The evolution of philosophy in the Soviet Union in the second half of the 1920s was rife with sharp debates on Leninist issues, amounting to a struggle for a scientific interpretation of the Leninist stage in the development of Marxist philosophy.

A few words about the term "Leninism" which arose in 20th-century Marxist literature. The concepts "Leninism" and "Leninists" were first used spontaneously by rank-and-file Communists and non-Party members towards the end of the economic rehabilitation period (1922-1924) and soon became widely current in the Soviet Union. Lenin vigorously objected to the use of these concepts in Party documents, firmly opposing all attempts to exaggerate his personality. For example, when in November 1920 the Central Committee was drafting a document on the anti-Marxist nature of A. Bogdanov's views on proletarian culture (a Central Committee circular "On the Proletkults" [51]) and one of the authors suggested that a general outline of Leninism should be provided, Lenin crossed out the word "Leninism" and put in "militant materialism". [52] Soon after Lenin's death, however, the 13th Party Conference placed a high value on the concept "Leninism", one of its resolutions reading: "To follow the example set by the largest proletarian organisations, groups for studying

Leninism should be established in all our organisations using Comrade Lenin's works as their basic material." [53] The conference evaluated Leninism as a great theoretical contribution to Marxism. In 1924, in one of his lectures on the foundations of Leninism delivered at the Sverdlov University, Stalin pronounced his famous formula: "Leninism is Marxism of the era of imperialism and the proletarian revolution." [54] Mikhail Kalinin, Chairman of the All-Russia Central Executive Committee and Member of the Party Central Committee, wrote: "Speaking of Lenin, for all the difference in the scope of his and Marx's revolutionary activities (which were much greater in Lenin's case), there is a striking similarity: Lenin has carried out a great amount of independent research and has played a tremendous role as a theorist." [55] The 13th Party Congress resolved to introduce Leninism in all social sciences taught at educational establishments [56] and to set up a research centre—The Lenin Institute—for studying and propagandising Lenin's theoretical works. The Congress also passed a resolution on publishing Lenin's *Complete Works* (This resolution was realised in the 1950s and 1960s).

Even before these resolutions were adopted, many Party theorists had a very high opinion of Lenin's creative activities and of his theoretical contribution to the evolution of Marxism. [57] A description of Leninism was first given in special readers which contained Lenin's most important ideas on certain problems of philosophy. [58] The publication, for the first time, of Lenin's note "On the Question of Dialectics" (1925) and particularly his complete *Philosophical Notebooks* (1929) was of vital importance.

In 1924 the Soviet scientific community began broad discussions on the essence and content of the philosophical ideas of Leninism. They were started by the dispute between A. Deborin, who published an article "Leninism—Militant Materialism" in the magazine *Pod znamenem marxizma* (Under the Banner of Marxism), and I. Skvortsov-Stepanov, who came out with criticism of Deborin's concept of dialectical materialism. Certain members of the opposition also voiced their views of Leninism (Trotsky, Zinoviev, Bukharin), along with some opportunistically-minded leaders of other communist parties (Karl Korsch, Georg Lukács and Anton Pannekoek among others).

The discussions came down to a general debate on the essence of Leninism. The general trend was to belittle and distort Leninism as 20th-century Marxism. The overt opponents of Leninism (Trotsky and Bukharin prominent among them), declared that Leninism was only the practice of the workers' movement in Russia, the application of Marxism to solve purely practical tasks of the revolution. Representatives of another trend (on the one hand Karl Korsch, then a member of the Communist Party of Germany, and on the other, Zinoviev and Kamenev, members of the "New Opposition") recognised Leninism not only as revolutionary practice, but also as a philosophy (although on a very limited scale), as Marxism applied to solve certain narrow theoretical problems. The former assessed Leninism as practice rather than theory, and the latter, as a "practical philosophy".

We should mention yet another trend in the interpretation of Leninism—that of Deborin and followers in the Soviet Union, and of Georg Lukács abroad, as well as the so-called Frankfurt circle which emerged in the 1920s and later developed into the notorious Frankfurt school of bourgeois neo-Marxism. These philosophers maintained that Leninism in philosophical terms was only a study of people's relations with nature and among themselves, and labelled Leninism a "philosophy of practice".

One of the most vulgar falsifications of Lenin's contribution to Marxism was the identification of Leninism with revolutionary practice, contrasting it to Marxism as a theory. This trend was launched by Karl Kautsky, a former Marxist who did his best to destroy the Second International in August 1914 and the proletarian revolution in Germany in 1918 and who was openly hostile to the October Revolution and the Soviet country. He showed his anti-Marxist views and his sheer hatred of Leninism in the booklets he wrote after the October Revolution—*The Dictatorship of the Proletariat* (1918) and *Terrorism and Communism* (1919).

Insisting that Leninism was exclusively the practice of the Russian Revolution, Kautsky essentially refuted the theory of the dictatorship of the proletariat. He ignored the fact that this theory had been worked on by Marx and Engels, and declared that Marxism as a theory and Leninism as practice differed as "two opposite methods: dem-

ocratic and dictatorial".[59] By asserting that Marx had never seen any connection between the dictatorship of the proletariat and the issue of state power and methods of administration, he brazenly falsified Marxism. He called Leninism "the dictatorship of the peasantry"[60] rather than "the dictatorship of the proletariat" and was not even abashed by the absurdity of such word-juggling. In his other booklet, *Terrorism and Communism,* Kautsky rejected the Marxist theory of the class struggle, declaring that "it is impossible to draw a clear demarcation-line between the bourgeoisie and the workers. There is always something arbitrary in such a demarcation which turns the very idea of Soviets into a highly appropriate foundation for a dictatorial, arbitrary rule".[61] Lenin exposed Kautsky's complete departure from Marxism back in 1918, in his work *The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky.* Kautsky's ideas on Leninism and the October Revolution were nevertheless adopted by opportunists within the ranks of the communist movement.

Prominent among these was Trotsky who never maintained a clearly defined theoretical position. He used the ideas of Kautsky and of even more rabid opportunists, anarchists and proponents of numerous anti-Marxist trends to concoct a kind of eclectic philosophy, in which idealism and metaphysics, positivism and Hegelianism, Social-Darwinism and vulgar mechanicism were mixed in a most bizarre way.

Long before the October Revolution Trotsky revealed his hostility to Leninism. But as Lenin's ideas prevailed in the Russian working-class movement and brought about the success of the Revolution, he tried to prove that his own ideas were close to Leninism. In his article "The Lessons of October", written after Lenin's death, Trotsky announced that Leninism was practical implementation of his own ideas. Some time before the Revolution Lenin wrote: "One day Trotsky plagiarises from the ideological stock-in-trade of one faction; the next day he plagiarises from that of another, and therefore declares himself to be standing *above* both factions."[62] After the Revolution Lenin repeatedly criticised Trotsky's ideas, warning the Party against the danger he presented to its unity and to defining a correct policy in the drive for socialism.[63]

In 1924, when Trotsky came out with "The Lessons of

October", the Party sharply censured the theoretical and political positions of Trotskyism. In a number of the broad Party discussions held at this time Trotskyism was denounced as an anti-Leninist and anti-Party trend, petty-bourgeois in class essence and vulgar in theoretical content. The 15th Party Congress exposed Trotskyism as petty-bourgeois radicalism and expelled Trotsky and his adherents from the Party ranks for propagating views incompatible with Communist Party membership.

A fresh attempt at interpreting Leninism as "practice" was launched by Nikolai Bukharin, another opportunist member of the Party. Lenin had criticised him before the October Revolution for his anarcho-syndicalist errors and after the Revolution exposed his inconsistent stand as leader of the so-called Left Communists (1918), then of the "Buffer Group" during the discussion on the trade unions (1921), and finally, as a "theoretician without dialectics", in his last "Letter to the Congress" (1922). In the early 1920s Bukharin, while posing as a theoretician, published several works in which he interpreted the theory of Marxism and the practice of socialist construction in the Soviet Union in his own way. His works did not contain such vulgar evaluations of the theoretical content of Leninism as those of Kautsky and Trotsky, but in treating philosophical problems he promulgated the views of his ideological teacher A. Bogdanov, in particular the latter's "theory of equilibrium" which he set against Marx's dialectics. Bukharin considered Lenin to be merely a political figure, completely ignoring the theoretical value of his ideas. Thus, he strove to draw a distinction between Marxism (in its largely positivist interpretation), and Leninism, which he saw as Lenin's practical activities.

The Party critically analysed Kautsky's assessment of Leninism, the views of Trotsky and his followers, and the position held by Bukharin. The criticism contained important positive conclusions. While exposing what was wrong with these ideas, the Party stressed the great theoretical significance of Leninism as a major trend in the development of Marx and Engels' ideas at a new historical stage. Particular emphasis was laid on the need to study Lenin's works, and this was defined as the main ideological task confronting the Communist Party.

During the 1920s, Karl Korsch and members of the so-

called New Opposition made speeches which were another form of anti-Leninism in the Communist Party. In 1923 Karl Korsch, then a member of the Communist Party of Germany, published his *Marxism and Philosophy,* in which he offered his own general assessment of Marxist philosophy and its impact on Lenin's ideas. Korsch declared Marxist philosophy to be a synthesis of Feuerbach's and Hegel's postulates thus rejecting Marxism as a fundamental, consistent theory. As far as Leninism was concerned, Korsch said, Lenin "was far from considering the main purpose of his theoretical works to be the ideological 'rehabilitation' of Marx's genuine teaching.[64] Korsch maintained that there were three independent ways to interpret Marxism at the time: Kautskianism, "Austro-Marxism", and Leninism.[65] The latter, he said, "serves to liberate from the fettering traditions of Social-Democratic Marxism that ... suppress the working people's ... consciousness, and is dictated by the practical needs of the new revolutionary stage in the proletariat's class struggle".[66] The main content of Leninism, he went on to explain, was its development of those "aspects of Marxism" immediately bearing on the 20th-century working-class movement. He thus reduced the theoretical value of Lenin's ideas to specific individual interpretations of the practical issues of the working-class movement.

Korsch's position invoked indignation among Marxists-Leninists the world over. Lenin's true disciples showed that Korsch intentionally belittled the content of Leninism and distorted its theoretical revolutionary essence. This was proved beyond any doubt when Korsch sided with the opportunists in the Communist Party of Germany soon after his book had been published. His views were promptly condemned by the CPG and he was expelled from its ranks. Subsequently he became one of the most rabid, overt enemies of Leninism and the world communist movement.

Zinoviev and Kamenev, leaders of the "New Opposition" in the Communist Party of the USSR (Bolsheviks), came out with their interpretation of Leninism at almost the same time as Korsch. In 1925, Zinoviev published a book entitled *Leninism,* in which he, like Korsch, attempted to interpret the content, place, and role of Leninism in the 20th century. He saw Leninism as a teaching which was

pertinent only to Russia, a country with a backward economy and predominantly peasant population, and reduced Lenin's theoretical ideas to tailoring Marxism to the conditions obtaining in Russia. He also maintained it would be impossible to realise what Lenin had predicted, the building of socialism in one country, classifying this as an error. Achieving socialism in the USSR, he said, hinged on revolution in the West—otherwise, the Soviet power would be doomed to failure.

Kamenev, who was Zinoviev's closest ally and collaborator in the "New Opposition", also contributed to distorting, in an oportunistic fashion, the concept of the Leninist stage in the development of Marxism. In his article "Leninism", written for the *Granat Encyclopaedia,* Kamenev called Leninism a theory which maintains "that no matter where a proletarian revolution begins, it can only be victorious if a number of countries are involved",[67] rather than a general theory of 20th-century Marxism or a general development trend in communist theoretical thought. Thus he reduced Leninism to a thesis on the possibility of the revolution triumphing "in a number of countries". This was not only an impudent revision of Lenin's doctrine on the socialist revolution; Kamenev's views implied that Lenin had just worked out several theoretical problems of Marxism and that his teaching as a whole did not present a consistent advancement of Marxist thought.

Zinoviev's and Kamenev's ideas met with a sharp rebuff from many Soviet Marxists. The inglorious defeat sustained by the "New Opposition" confirmed the theoretical untenability of its leaders' views.

The third trend in the attempts to distort Leninism during the philosophical discussions of the 1920s was led by Georg Lukács; it also included Soviet philosophical groups led by A. Deborin and I. Skvortsov-Stepanov.

In 1923, Georg Lukács, a prominent Hungarian philosopher who had taken a very active part in the 1919 Hungarian revolution, published his book *History and Class Consciousness,* which became the gospel of the right-wing revisionists. The enemies of Marxism refer to it to this day, trying to prove the plausibility of their views. Lukács himself wrote of his book some time later: "At that stage I was just passing from Hegel's philosophy to Marx-

ism. Besides, this Marxism [he means the ideas he developed in his *History and Class Consciousness.—L. S.*] was an extreme sectarian variety burdened with Luxemburgian survivals. My position at that stage was erroneous with respect to the most crucial issues of dialectics. I rejected the theory of reflection in part, and the dialectics of nature as a whole." [68] This self-critical statement of Lukács' shows that he repudiated many fundamental propositions of Leninism. He also provided many erroneous and harmful tenets in his evaluation of Leninism. In his article "Lenin", for example, which he wrote just after the great leader of the proletarian revolution had died, Lukács said that the significance of Leninism was that it worked out issues concerned with human experience and the interaction of people and entire communities. He considered Leninism only as a philosophy of practice, ignoring its general ideological and general social content. Lukács' ideas were sharply criticised by Marxist scientists. As far back as 1920, Lenin wrote, with respect to one of Lukács' articles, that it was "very Left-wing and very poor. Its Marxism is purely verbal; its distinction between 'defensive' and 'offensive' tactics is artificial; it gives no concrete analysis of precise and definite historical situations; it takes no account of what is most essential." [69] After the publication of Lukács' book, a discussion was held on it at the Socialist Academy. László Rudas, a well-known Hungarian Marxist, pointed out that Lukács' concept "is not a proletarian point of view, but that of an intellectual who has hardly any knowledge of real life", that Lukács borrowed his ideas "from books, to be more exact, from books by various bourgeois philosophers". [70] Rudas' stand was supported by other scientists. Lukács' viewpoint came under devastating criticism as having nothing in common with Marxism. Later he recognised his errors and adopted a correct view of the role played by Lenin and his ideas.

A. Deborin, a former Menshevik, student of Plekhanov's and prominent figure in Soviet philosophy in the 1920s, also criticised Lukács' book for its formal and abstract approach. His own views, however, were very close to Lukács', as became evident soon afterwards.

Somewhat later in 1924, Deborin came out with an article on Lenin in the magazine *Pod znamenem marxizma,*

which he later extended and published as a book, *Lenin the Thinker*. While emphasising Lenin's role as the leader of the Party and the revolutionary proletariat, he drew a clear distinction between Lenin as a "political figure" and a "practical worker", and Plekhanov as a philosopher. In Deborin's opinion, Lenin only occasionally touched upon philosophical problems in his works, and even then by way of applying, rather than developing, Marx's ideas. In his preface to Lenin's *Philosophical Notebooks* Deborin wrote: "If he [Lenin.—*L. S.*] accomplished the cause he had undertaken he would have substantially promoted dialectical materialism and lifted it to a higher stage." [71], which was tantamount to asserting that Lenin's work was only a preparatory draft for a book which he planned but never wrote—an approach which one can still come across today.

The main content of Leninism according to Deborin is the politics and tactics of the working-class movement. [72] Hence its theoretical content is reduced to isolated fragments which do not comprise a single whole. Deborin's disciples and collaborators tried to substantiate and clarify the views put forward by their teacher. As a result, towards the end of the 1920s, a group of Soviet philosophers was formed, calling themselves "dialectitians"; their opponents, however, labelled them "formalists", or a "formalist deviation".

Deborin was criticised by I. Skvortsov-Stepanov, a prominent Marxist, and by many other scholars, mostly natural scientists interested in philosophical problems. Their stand may largely be described as follows: while saying many flattering things about Lenin and Leninism, they interpreted Leninism in their own way, considering it an attempt to reduce complex forms of motion of matter to an elementary one, i.e. to mechanical motion. In their opinion, dialectics could be translated into a language of mechanical laws. In the history of the discussions of the 1920s this grouping is known as the mechanists. Polemics between Deborin's followers and the mechanists involved many vital issues of Marxist-Leninist philosophy but did not produce any positive solutions, because neither of the sides held the correct viewpoint with respect to Marxism as a whole and Leninism in particular. In the late 1920s the polemics assumed a more scholastic and

abstract character, and the erroneous views of both sides became more manifest.

In October 1930, the Presidium of the Communist Academy spent two days discussing the situation in Soviet philosophy. It was pointed out that both the Deborinites and the mechanicists were at fault. Two years earlier, in 1928, mechanicism was largely seen as a particular revival of positivism in Soviet philosophy, and this criticism was now summed up. The Presidium adopted a resolution which read: "The views of Deborin's group are most vividly expressed in the following: a) they divorce theory from practice; b) they underestimate Lenin as a theoretician in general and as a Marxist philosopher in particular; c) they deny that Leninism has a place in philosophy as a new, higher development stage of dialectical materialism; d) they aggravate Plekhanov's errors in philosophy and historical materialism; and e) they misinterpret and distort Lenin's principle of partisanship in philosophy." [73]

On January 25, 1931, the Central Committee adopted a resolution "On the Magazine *Pod znamenem marxizma*", which said: "Despite certain achievements in its work, particularly in the struggle against mechanicism, which was an attempt to revise Marxism, the magazine has failed to comply with Lenin's instruction . . . ." This resulted from the dissident position taken by its leaders—Deborin and his followers Karev, Sten, et al. "While divorcing philosophy from politics", the resolution went on, "and not sticking in all its work to the principle of partisanship in philosophy . . . the group at the head of the magazine has revived one of the most harmful traditions and dogmas of the Second International, that of divorcing theory from practice, and has thus taken a Menshevist, idealist stand on a number of fundamental issues." [74] The resolution outlined the main problems confronting Marxist philosophy and pointed out that "the main task of the magazine *Pod znamenem marxizma* is to implement the programme set for it by Lenin, to work out the issues in the Leninist stage of dialectical materialism, and to ruthlessly criticise all anti-Marxist and, therefore, anti-Leninist philosophical tenets". [75]

Thus, as we have seen, the discussions in the 1920s on the problems of Leninism resulted in delineating the main direction to be taken in order to develop Marxist philoso-

phical thought in the Soviet Union and in the world communist movement: that of studying, elaborating on and disseminating the philosophical ideas of Leninism, while continuing with practical aspects of the world revolutionary process and with socialist construction in the USSR. In the course of these discussions the number of philosophers belonging to the Party increased and their views were forged in all areas of Marxist philosophical knowledge. Marxist philosophers established a close link with progressive natural scientists in the Soviet Union and clarified many cardinal philosophical problems involved in the natural and social sciences, as well as in socialist construction.

By the 1930s, i.e. by the time the foundations of socialism had been laid in the Soviet Union, Marxist-Leninist philosophical thought had greatly advanced in ideological and theoretical terms. The essential conditions had been created for launching broader research in all the most important directions and on all the fundamental issues to do with the Leninist stage of Marxist philosophy. And, most important of all, it had been demonstrated and proved that the Leninist stage did not end with Lenin's death. His ideas have determined the course of Marxist philosophical thought for a long historical perspective; they live, develop and act, now as before. Broader research in the field of Marxist philosophy in the future is therefore nothing but the implementation of the action programme outlined by Lenin for the philosophical science of Marxism.

4. The Victory of Socialism in the USSR and Lenin's Philosophical Legacy

By the end of the 1920s, the Leninist stage of Marxist philosophy had become one of the central trends in the development of world Marxist thought. We are talking here essentially of the whole range of problems facing Marxist philosophy in the new historical epoch. Between the 1930s and the 1970s work on the problems of the Leninist stage can be broken into three main periods. The first of these lasted through the 1930s and ended when the Great

Patriotic War of the Soviet people against Hitler's fascism broke out. The second period embraced the war years and those immediately following it, and is marked by the emergence of the world socialist system and the collapse of imperialist colonial domination. The third period—the 1960s and the 1970s—was when a developed socialist society was established in the Soviet Union and mature socialism was constructed in the world socialist community countries, young sovereign states emerged in Asia, Africa and Latin America, and the general crisis of capitalism worsened in the countries making up the world capitalist system.

In the 1930s, several works were written by Soviet and foreign Marxists on problems of dialectical materialism. In these Lenin's most important propositions on dialectics and materialism were evaluated and given concrete expression. The scholars of the Communist Academy Institute of Philosophy published a fundamental work *Dialectical and Historical Materialism* (a textbook for Communist Universities and higher technical educational establishments), which summed up the path travelled by Marxist-Leninist philosophical thought during the 1920s. The authors outlined the principal issues of Marxist philosophical theory and generalised the experience gained in building socialism in the USSR and in promoting the world revolutionary process, and world social development as a whole.[76] The arrangement of material in the book and the problems posed give a good notion of the approach taken at that time to philosophical problems and of the level at which they were analysed. The first part of the book, for example, dealing with dialectical materialism, examines the following issues: Marxism-Leninism as the world view of the proletariat (with Leninism included as a new and higher stage in the development of Marxism); materialism and idealism (the sources and history of the emergence of Marxist philosophy); crucial problems of dialectical materialism (the materiality of the world, matter and consciousness, the theories of evolution and knowledge); the laws of dialectics; the ideological struggle in Marxist philosophy; and a general assessment of the Leninist stage in Marxist philosophical theory.

Collectively-written works treating particular problems of dialectical materialism—certain issues of dialectics, phil-

osophical problems in the natural sciences, the theory of knowledge, logic, history of philosophy, etc.—were also published in this period. [77] Those further elaborating Lenin's ideas on the modern revolution in natural science deserve special mention. Besides philosophers, many outstanding natural scientists, who adopted dialectical materialism, also contributed to these works, among them Paul Langevin, one of the founders of nuclear physics, his disciple Fréderic Joliot-Curie, British natural scientist and historian John Bernal, N. and S. Vavilov, A. Joffe, et al. In the last years of his life, the great Russian scientist Ivan Pavlov actively participated in the investigation, from a materialist standpoint, of the philosophical problems involved in the physiology of higher nervous activity. And V. Nevsky, V. Adoratsky, A. Lunacharsky and many other prominent Leninist Communists exerted every effort to disseminate the Marxist-Leninist world outlook.

Among the books on problems of dialectical materialism which appeared in the 1930s, the fundamental *Theory of Reflection,* written by the outstanding Bulgarian Marxist Todor Pavlov, deserves special praise. This book, which came off the press in 1936, dealt with such cardinal issues of Marxist-Leninist philosophy as the unity of matter and consciousness, object and image, and theory and practice, the link between philosophy and the specialised sciences, the Marxist-Leninist theory of truth, and so on. Pavlov carried out a far-reaching analysis of the inter-relationship between philosophy, on the one hand, and physics, psychology, linguistics and many other spheres of special knowledge, on the other. The book was important since it gave impetus for the further investigation and development of Lenin's theory of reflection, and added greatly to the overall study of the Leninist stage in Marxist philosophy.

In 1939, a prominent Soviet physicist Sergei Vavilov, President of the USSR Academy of Sciences, published a highly-commendable book, *Lenin and Physics,* in which he showed how Lenin's philosophical ideas should be applied to recent advances in physics. He thoroughly analysed Lenin's theses on the crisis in physics at the turn of the century, and on the modern revolution in natural science, which manifests the combining of specific investigation of the material world with profound philosophical generalisa-

tions, as provided by Lenin in his *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism.*

The outstanding American mathematician and Marxist philosopher, Dirk J. Struik, in his work *Mathematics and Marxism,* considered Lenin's ideas with respect to modern advances in mathematical knowledge. Similar investigations were carried out in biology, psychology, linguistics, etc.

At the end of the 1930s, the work being done on the problems of dialectical materialism was complicated as a result of the absolute judgements made by Stalin in his *On Dialectical and Historical Materialism.* This work, which was written in 1938 to help those who had just begun studying Marxist-Leninist philosophy, presented certain problems of dialectical materialism in an oversimplified way: for example, the laws of materialist dialectics and its categories were not mentioned at all, while the theory of matter and consciousness was given in extremely general terms. Such an approach led to a one-sided development of a number of issues of dialectical materialism. The investigation of the problems of the Leninist stage of dialectical materialism did not "stop", however, as many bourgeois Sovietologists assert. Even a cursory glance at the titles of books and articles on philosophy published over this period clearly indicates that research in this field continued and expanded.[78]

Great progress was also made in the 1930s in working out the problems of historical materialism. Documents of the world communist movement, the CPSU(B) congresses, and speeches by outstanding Soviet Party and state leaders were crucial to the development and detailed analysis of Lenin's ideas on social evolution. The Seventh Congress of the Communist International (1935), for example, exposed the social essence of fascism as a terrorist dictatorship of the most reactionary representatives of financial capital and called for all anti-fascist forces to rally together in a united front to fight for peace and social progress. These ideas were undoubtedly a step forward in the Leninist analysis of imperialism and enriched it on the basis of recent historical experience. At the 17th and 18th CPSU(B) congresses, many new ideas were formulated on socialist society and its motive forces, on the class shifts that occurred after the victory of the socialist sys-

tem in the USSR, on the changes that took place in the functions of the socialist state, on ways of developing the economy, socio-political processes, and science and culture under the new conditions of socialism.

The second part of the above-mentioned textbook *Dialectical and Historical Materialism*[79] was also crucially important. It treated the following problems: the essence of the materialist understanding of history, the Marxist theory of the socio-economic formation, the capitalist and the socialist social systems, the theory of classes and the state, the dictatorship of the proletariat and the transition from capitalism to socialism, issues of social consciousness, the Marxist-Leninist theory of revolution, and the ideological struggle in the sphere of social evolution. Special emphasis was laid on the significance of Lenin's contribution to the Marxist theory of social development. The importance of Lenin's theory of imperialism, his development of the theory of socialist revolution and his teaching on the laws governing socialist and communist construction were revealed for the first time in Marxist literature. All problems of philosophy were thoroughly dealt with, and the ideological struggle waged by Lenin and his disciples against bourgeois sociology, the philosophy of social-reformism, right and "left" opportunism and revisionism was vividly described.

F. Gorokhov's book, *Lenin and Historical Materialism* (1934) was also notable in its analysis of the problems of the Leninist stage in the social theory of Marxism. It consistently examined Lenin's main tenets on the historical process, classes and the class struggle, and revolution and the state, as applied to 20th-century events and socialist construction in the Soviet Union.

Much work was also done in the 1930s on the history of Marxist-Leninist philosophy. It was at this time that special research into the essence of the Leninist stage in Marxist philosophy was carried out. Place of honour among the works of this research that came out belongs to V. Adoratsky, who provided a general outline of Lenin's contribution to Marxist philosophy and exhaustively analysed Lenin's major philosophical works—*Materialism and Empirio-Criticism* and *Philosophical Notebooks*. In 1940, an interesting work by B. Chagin, *Lenin's Struggle for Marxist Materialism in the 1890s*, was published. Mention

should also be made of A. Shcheglov's *Lenin's Struggle Against Bogdanov's Revision of Marxism* (1937), and many other works.

As a whole, the 1930s saw an extensive, many-sided and fruitful development of Marxist-Leninist philosophy. Lenin's ideas were comprehensively evolved and would have been elaborated on in many other studies if it had not been for the war unleashed by Hitler's fascism, which became the Soviet people's Great Patriotic War for their freedom and independence, for peace and social progress throughout the world.

The war, naturally, exerted great influence on the work of Marxist philosophers. Most of them took part in the armed struggle against the aggressors, and those who remained in the rear gave all their energy to ideological activities connected with the war.

It goes without saying that the main task of philosophy was to expose fascism in ideological terms, to criticise the theoretical roots of its inhuman practices. Dozens of books and hundreds of articles were written during the war, showing, on the basis of Lenin's theory of imperialism, the historical place of fascism on the eve of proletarian revolution in the major capitalist countries. At the same time, philosophical works revealed the aims and essence of social progress and substantiated the need to defeat the fascist regimes and to completely eliminate these evil forces and phenomena from the life of society.

Despite all the war-time privations, work continued on general philosophical problems, including those of the Leninist stage of Marxist philosophy, on which work had started in the 1920s and the 1930s. In 1942, Soviet philosophers celebrated the 25th anniversary of Soviet philosophy. Special articles and scientific conferences were devoted to the event. Soviet philosophers pointed out that Soviet philosophical science, that had been promoted by Lenin, was developing and gaining strength, and that Lenin's programme of upholding and advancing Marxist philosophical theory was the ideological basis underlying every aspect of the philosophical work done in the Soviet Union.

In 1943, the CPSU Central Committee, despite the austere wartime conditions, examined a purely philosophical problem: the content of the first three volumes of the *His-*

tory of Philosophy, the first attempt at outlining the development of world philosophy on the basis of the Marxist-Leninist method. The fact that the Central Committee found it necessary to consider a philosophical work in the difficult wartime conditions reveals the great importance the Party attached to the state of philosophy in the country, to the struggle for fulfilling the tasks set by Lenin in the sphere of philosophy.

After the victorious conclusion of the war, Soviet philosophers, together with Marxist philosophers all over the world, resumed work on carrying out their programme, interrupted by the fascist invasion. This concerned first of all problems involved in studying the Leninist stage of Marxist philosophy. In 1947, an all-Union philosophical discussion was held on G. Alexandrov's book *The History of West-European Philosophy.* The participants underscored that an analysis of the issues involved in the Leninist stage was central to the Marxist history of philosophy. After the discussion philosophy departments at Soviet universities introduced a general course on the history of Marxist philosophy into their curricula, the history of 20th-century Marxism, i.e. the Leninist stage, making a distinctive part thereof. Special chairs and departments were set up at major scientific and educational centres.

In the latter half of the 1940s and the early 1950s, a number of profound works on the philosophical problems of Leninism were published in the USSR and the countries that had embarked on the socialist path. Lenin's ideas on the materialist understanding of history were examined in *Historical Materialism* (1950) and *The Forms of Social Consciousness* (1951), written by groups of authors and edited by F. Konstantinov. The role of the masses as the decisive force in history was analysed in M. Kammari's *The People as the Creator of History,* and the people's creative activity, in H. Momjan's *Socialist Society and the Masses' Creative Activity,* both of which were published in 1954. The development of natural science and its philosophical aspects, viewed from the angle of Lenin's ideas, were treated in S. Vavilov's *Soviet Science at a New Stage* (1946), John Bernal's *Science and Society,* and Jean-Toussaint Desanti's *Science as a Form of Social Consciousness* (Russian translations of the two latter books ap-

peared in 1953), and in a number of other works. The general philosophical problems of Marxism were investigated by the British Marxist Maurice Cornforth in his *Dialectical Materialism* (Russian translation published in 1956).

In the early 1950s, Marxist philosophers the world over published many works, some of which were translated into Russian and incorporated in collections of articles, such as *The French Communists in the Struggle for a Progressive Ideology* (1953), *Britain's Figures in the Struggle for an Advanced Ideology* (1954), *U.S. Progressives in the Struggle for an Advanced Ideology* (1955). All of these criticised major trends in contemporary bourgeois philosophy and sociology and dealt with the main issues of Marxism-Leninism in the post-war conditions.

As a result of this work a broad programme had been outlined by the mid-1950s, for the development of Marxist-Leninist philosophical thought against the background of the emerging world socialist system, collapsing imperialist colonial domination, and a drive for peace and social progress throughout the world.

In the mid-1950s, world capitalism intensified its ideological offensive against socialism, dreaming as it did of reversing the development of the young socialist states. Marxist philosophers on their part vigorously rebuffed the attempts to distort and diminish the historical significance of Leninism.

In the 1950s and the early 1960s, Lenin's ideas were extensively developed in the documents of the CPSU and the world communist movement, primarily in those of the 1957 Meeting of the Communist and Workers' Parties in Moscow. These contain a far-reaching analysis of the salient features of social development over the period when the world socialist system was in the making. A substantial contribution to Leninism was made by the 20th CPSU Congress, which considered the errors and shortcomings caused by Stalin's personality cult. Vital questions of Marxist-Leninist philosophy were debated at the scientific discussions that took place in the early 1950s: in linguistics (1950), political economy (1951), etc.

In all these documents, Lenin's ideas were developed and given concrete expression through generalising from the experience of the postwar development of socialism

and the entire world revolutionary process, and from the unflagging struggle for peace and progress waged by all the peoples of the globe.

5. Lenin's Philosophical Ideas and the Present Time

In 1970, the world marked the centenary of Lenin's birth. A CPSU document which was adopted shortly before, gave the following assessment of the Leninist stage in Marxist theory: "Leninism is a new, higher stage of Marxism, its creative development in new historical conditions, in the conditions of imperialism and proletarian revolutions, and of the transition of humankind from capitalism to socialism and communism . . . The Leninist stage is not limited to Lenin's lifetime, but continues in the theoretical activities of the CPSU and the fraternal parties and is embodied in the policy principles of the world communist movement." [80] The CPSU Central Committee Theses *The Centenary of Lenin's Birth* read: "Leninism is the methodology of revolutionary thinking and revolutionary action . . . . Lenin was the greatest scientist in revolution and the greatest revolutionary in science, a man who inaugurated a new stage in Marxist theory and enriched all the component parts of Marxism, i.e., philosophy, political economy, and scientific communism." [81]

In the 1960s and 1970s, Marxist philosophers in the Soviet Union and elsewhere wrote a number of works on the Leninist stage in Marxist philosophy. [82] These works provided a generalised analysis of the essence of the Leninist stage, its content and the main lines along which the ideas of the great thinker and leader of the world revolution developed, and delineated the general state of Marxist-Leninist philosophy at the turn of the 1970s.

The authors of *Leninism and Contemporary Philosophical Problems* pointed out: "The historical experience of social and scientific development in the 20th century, the confrontation between the systems of socialism and imperialism in the modern epoch, the struggle of Marxist-Leninist theory against bourgeois ideology and the dogmatic attitudes and revisionist vacillations apparent in the international working-class movement prove beyond any doubt that Leninism, whose creative spirit is upheld by Commu-

nists, has linked scientific philosophical thought with the revolutionary actions of the working class, the broad masses, and has become a symbol of the ever continuing onward movement of philosophical knowledge, of the revolutionary change of the world in the interests of man." [83]

Examining Lenin's contribution to the development of materialist dialectics, which is the nucleus, the decisive revolutionary force in Marxist philosophy, was central to working out the philosophical problems of Leninism at this time. Lenin capsulised the contribution made by Marx and Engels to world philosophical thought into two words: "materialist dialectics"; these meaningful words can be applied in all justice to his own philosophical work.

Lenin provided an exhaustive description of Marxist dialectical theory in his *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism, Philosophical Notebooks, Karl Marx,* and several other works. Later on, Marxist philosophers gave great weight to his ideas on the general theory of the evolution of the world, on the theory of cognising it and the logic of theoretical thinking, though Lenin saw this problem in a much broader light, always including in his dialectical analysis not just the world and man's cognition of it, but also the problem of its practical transformation. In the late 1960s and the early 1970s, developed socialism became a reality. Managing the social process in a scientific way assumed special significance, and materialist dialectics, as the theory and method underlying the practical activities of the people, consciously using the objective laws of nature and society to change the world, were brought to the forefront. Lenin repeatedly emphasised this aspect of dialectics, which, in the opinion of the author of the present book, is a major problem of Leninism as applied to the present day.

No less relevant now is Lenin's theory of reflection. His ideas on the essence of reflection as a universal property of matter have assumed special significance in connection with the "information explosion" in the later half of the 20th century. The snowballing of information in the course of today's scientific and technological revolution, and great social changes, have made the theory of information, value approach and value analysis central to modern research, embracing practically every field of knowledge about man

and the world he lives in. Marxists-Leninists have proved that philosophical concepts about the exchange of information are based on Lenin's theory of reflection, which has armed contemporary science and practice with a genuinely scientific method of cognising, evaluating, interpreting and transforming the material world.

Dialectical logic is the third issue worked out by modern experts on Leninism. Lenin set great store by the problem of the dialectic of theoretical thinking. In our day, as the scale and scope of scientific thinking tend to increase at an ever greater rate, the problems of dialectical logic have become especially vital. We may well say that all contemporary science is permeated with dialectics. This explains the growing part played in today's scientific progress by Lenin's treatment of such philosophical problems as the object and the subject of dialectical thinking, the theory of truth, and the laws and categories of dialectical logic, etc.

Lenin's ideas on the dialectic of social development are of great interest today. Lenin's ideas on the dynamics of the 20th-century social process, characterised by an increased role of the working people's revolutionary initiative, are relevant to the contemporary world revolutionary process. Combined with the theory of Marxism, this initiative has enhanced the pace of social evolution many times over. The processes that dragged on for dozens and hundreds of years in the past are now consummated in a few years and on an unprecedented scale. Extremely important are Lenin's ideas on the dialectic of leaps and gradualness in social development and on the diversity and dialectical essence of the qualitative shifts typical of contemporary society. Today, science pays particular attention to Lenin's views on the dialectic of the national and the international in the general social process. His well-known propositions on the dialectic of the general and the specific are being given concrete expression in revolutionary movements in various countries, in the specific and common features of the struggle between progress and reaction against the background of humankind's general transition from capitalism to socialism.

Analysis of modern national revolutionary movements reveals their importance as the reserve and ally of the world socialist revolution. At the same time, a concrete

examination of different countries shows that these movements are based on the laws of the class struggle, i.e. that the general historical tendency for the progressive national liberation movements in oppressed and dependent countries is to join the struggle of the world proletariat against capitalism. These developments once more testify to the great vitality and relevance of Lenin's ideas in analysing modern world social progress.

The relevance of Lenin's theoretical legacy becomes particularly evident when examining contemporary social processes in socialist countries and in the world socialist community as a whole. Today, Marxist-Leninist thought reveals that Lenin's theoretical works contain ideas which scientifically anticipated the way socialist society has developed; these ideas have only recently been translated into reality. Of paramount importance are Lenin's predictions that socialism would not triumph in many countries simultaneously, that the socialist revolution would merge with the national liberation movements of suppressed nations, forming a single world revolutionary process, that the community of countries taking the socialist road would be gradually enlarged, that the class struggle between world socialism and world capitalism would assume a specific form of peaceful competition in the economy, peaceful coexistence in political relations, and uncompromising struggle in ideology. We should also emphasise the significance of Lenin's ideas on the general laws of socialist construction—on building a powerful material and technical basis, establishing new social relations and shaping a new socialist man. All these ideas have been brilliantly confirmed in countries that have chosen the path of socialism.

Ever greater significance attaches to Lenin's ideas on the dialectic of the objective and the subjective in the development of socialist society, especially his remarks on the essence of and interaction between the object and the subject of history, social knowledge and action, and a scientific guidance of the evolution towards communism. Soviet science is carrying out in-depth studies of Lenin's prophecies on the dialectic of the objective and the subjective conditions of social development under socialism, their unity and dynamic interdependence. Lenin's proposition that the role of the subjective factor would grow as socialist so-

ciety advances towards maturity, towards a gradual transition from the first stage of communism to its higher stage, has also become very relevant in our day.

Lenin showed how the subjective factor operated in various spheres of social development: in the economy, social relations and the intellectual life of society. Today the Party proceeds from his conclusions in shaping its policy on providing material and moral incentives for the working people, stimulating their profound belief in the righteousness of the communist cause, rallying the masses around the Party and inculcating in them the Marxist-Leninist world outlook.

Lenin's ideas on politics and its role in the life of society occupy a special place in his ideological works. His definition of politics as a concentrated expression of economics, as well as his thesis that politics cannot but prevail over economics are in fact pivotal to the political activities of the Party and the Soviet state in their drive to communism.

The political life of a developed socialist society is now entirely based on these ideas. The science-based political leadership of society brings the political consciousness of mature socialism closer to science, thus making the policy of the Communist Party and socialist state an essentially scientific form of activity.

Today there is no social force in the world more powerful than the communist movement, whose strength lies in the fact that it is rooted in science, while its aims and ideals correspond to the fundamental needs and aspirations of the overwhelming majority of humankind—the working people. It follows then that communist policy is essentially the most humane outline of the purposes and ideals of human activities, corresponding to the needs of each working person and of humanity as a whole.

Political life under socialism is shaped in conformity with the objective laws of social development. Under developed socialism, the role of scientific principles in determining the Party's political line becomes increasingly greater. Advanced science and technology become a major stimulus to social development as socialist production relations improve.

Lenin repeatedly turned in his works to the problems of scientific and technical progress. He saw imperialism as

a historical stage at which the material and technical foundation of socialism was laid, and said that scientific and technical progress under imperialism is a step towards socialism.

Lenin's view that the revolutionary advances of 20th-century science and technology are indispensable in the entire modern world revolutionary process is especially relevant now that the scientific and technological revolution is under way. The growing social role of scientific knowledge has today become a salient feature of social development at all levels. In these conditions Lenin's ideas on the great role scientific knowledge plays in the socialist and communist construction are assuming increasing practical significance.

The science-based policy pursued by the Soviet Union and the fraternal socialist countries implies giving varied stimuli to work done in science and technology. Combining the latest breakthroughs in science and technology with the achievements of socialism is opening up vast prospects in the socialist world for the scientific and technological revolution, while the constant attention of the Party and government to the needs of science provides a basis for the social role of science to grow and become more active.

We should specially emphasise the increased role and significance of Marxist-Leninist theory, for it is the general ideological basis of socialism. The Marxist-Leninist education of the masses, and the fact that science and practical activities are backed up by the conclusions and generalisations of the Marxist-Leninist world outlook are a gigantic force under these conditions.

The ideas of scientifically guiding society are gaining in importance in the contemporary world. They occupy a place of honour in Leninism's theoretical arsenal, the most important among them being the question of the place and role of administrative relations in the system of modern social development. Lenin's ideas on the need for an integral guidance of social processes while building socialism and communism have been further elaborated. Very relevant today are his prophecy on the importance of scientific information in social management and his ideas on scientific prediction as the basis for managing socialist society, while his propositions on the decisive role of the mas-

ses in the historical process are the most important theoretical postulates of modern social research.

All of these propositions are being studied and elaborated in detail by Marxists-Leninists who have written a number of works in which Lenin's fundamental ideas are creatively applied and amplified, and the experience, gained in the management of developed socialist society over recent decades, is being generalised in a scientific way. On this basis a universal theory of social administration under socialism has been created, embracing philosophy, sociology, political economy, scientific communism and other branches of social science.

The latest works dealing with the Leninist stage in Marxist philosophy also examine many problems related to the Marxist-Leninist teaching on man and his intellectual life. The following major directions can be traced: problems of Marxist-Leninist humanism and their relevance today; philosophical problems of man in Lenin's ideological works; problems of shaping a new socialist man; general description of society's intellectual life under socialism; Lenin's teaching on socialist culture and the laws of its development; criticism of religion and propaganda of atheism in socialist society; communist ethics; contemporary problems of value analysis in the light of Leninism.

In discussing the theory of humanism, Lenin's fundamental thesis should be taken into account, i.e. that humanism, love of man and a sense of responsibility for other people are inextricably linked with the general notion of democracy.[84] For Marxism, this does not come down to ABC principles of renouncing social evil, but implies recognition of man and human communities as conscious creative forces, the highest form of their manifestation being the revolutionary struggle to liberate the working people from exploitation. Lenin's historic merit is that he linked humanism with science and social knowledge, thus transforming it from the sum-total of abstract principles into a system of theoretical concepts to help people change the world in a revolutionary way.

Lenin pointed out that progress in the productive forces and production relations is a decisive factor in developing genuinely humane relations among people. He noted that capitalism plays a relatively progressive role in the evolution of society. However, he went on to say that only

under socialism, only after the exploiter society has been eliminated, would it be possible to achieve genuine social progress and really humane relations among people.

Marx and Engels wrote that the highest aim of communism was the free and harmonious development of man. Lenin made this thesis more specific, saying that the socialist society of the future should make it its aim to provide "*full* well-being and free, *all-round* development for *all* the members of society".[85] This proposition has been developed in recent CPSU documents, in particular, in the decisions of its 25th and 26th congresses which emphasised that an all-round development of a new man in a developed socialist society requires tackling a large set of problems; such as preserving and multiplying natural wealth, promoting the productive forces, blending practice and science, further developing socialist democracy, and achieving a unified balanced system of labour, ideological and moral education of the working people.

Lenin's concept of humanism is indissolubly linked with the theory of the proletariat's class struggle against capitalism. Only in this struggle, whatever form it takes, is a true scientific interpretation of humanism shaped and consolidated as awareness of the cohesion of the entire society, the elimination of the contradictions existing between the interests of individuals and society, and the emergence of a new historical community in the USSR — the Soviet people, rallied together by their common world outlook and goals, and by their confidence in the historical justification and righteousness of their cause.

Lenin's conception of man's place and role in social progress is as important as the other problems of cultural life he examined, but it was not dealt with in sufficient detail by the students of the Leninist stage for some time, which enabled the adversaries of Leninism to insist that Lenin had not touched upon it.[86] A thorough study of Lenin's philosophical works, however, reveals that the great leader of the proletarian revolution provided a profound and comprehensive account of the problems of socialist humanism.

The major principle Lenin put forward in considering the problem of man is as follows: "In his practical activity, man is confronted with the objective world, is dependent on it, and determines his activity by it."[87] He felt that

the solution of the problem lay in freeing man from everything that hampers the development of his abilities and the establishment of a genuine cohesion among people on the basis of socialist and communist principles.

In the post-October period, when the building of the new society became a priority, Lenin stressed once more that the major treasure of socialism was man and his life.[88] Shaping a harmoniously developed and well-educated person with a rich intellectual life and a great variety of links with society, he explained, was the essence of socialist and communist construction.[89] Lenin called for all the cultural wealth accumulated by humankind to be used to achieve this task, while taking account of the individual features of each person, and looking for new forms of education.[90] All these ideas have played an outstanding part in the communist education of Soviet people. Today, they invest the world communist movement with a scientific approach to the main aims and means in the drive for a new man, endowed with creative talent—a genuine master of his own fate.

Lenin elaborated his theory of the individual in close connection with the problem of man. In the 19th century, Marx proposed his idea of the alienation of the working individual from the material and cultural social values he had himself created, and of an antagonistic contradiction between the individual and an exploiter society. Lenin developed these ideas, applying them to the experience gained in the revolutions of the 20th century and in the construction of socialism started in the USSR. Over the first few years of his theoretical and political activities, Lenin examined the Marxist concept of the individual. He pointed out that Marx based his scientific view of the individual on the principle of determinism, which explained human actions in terms of natural and historical necessity. This principle, Lenin said, does not deny the active role of the individual in history. It implies that in assessing the activity of the individual one should define what conditions ensure the success of his actions, what guarantee is there that these actions will not remain an isolated act lost in a welter of contrary acts?[91]

In the Soviet period, Lenin formulated general principles for educating a new socialist man. He addressed the main one to the Communists: "We are obliged to begin

with ourselves." [92] Next in importance is the ability to reveal and analyse one's own mistakes. He wrote: "We must ... immediately begin to learn, on the basis of the mistakes made, how to organise the struggle better." [93] Yet another principle is to stir the masses all over the world to greater activity in tackling nation-wide problems and administering new societies. With the advance of socialist society, these ideas have become the programme for shaping the socialist man. They have been creatively developed and worked out in detail in the decisions of recent CPSU congresses and CPSU Central Committee plenary meetings and in resolutions of the CPSU Central Committee and the Soviet government.

Among the general problems of the cultural development of society Lenin pointed to the need to criticise religious views and propagandise scientific atheism. In a number of works written before the October Revolution, he formulated Marxism's general approach to this vital issue. In the Soviet period, he insisted that the Party's anti-religious activity should be developed in every way and that the ideas of scientific atheism should be worked out and disseminated. This task, he said, requires carrying out a series of measures to propagate the achievements of the natural and social sciences, imparting to the working people a genuinely scientific outlook and an ability to assess life from the standpoint of Marxist ideology merged with the sum-total of recent achievements in various sciences. It is also necessary, Lenin noted, to wage a ruthless and systematic struggle against modern "graduated flunkeys of clericalism".

The essence of cultural progress under socialism, Lenin wrote, is that before the socialist revolution, the "human genius, the brain of man, created only to give some the benefits of technology and culture, and to deprive others of the bare necessities, education and development. From now on all the marvels of science and the gains of culture belong to the nation as a whole and never again will man's brain and human genius be used for oppression and exploitation." [94] To bring this about, he went on to say, socialism must turn the "sum total of the very rich, historically inevitable and necessary for us store of culture and knowledge and technique accumulated by capitalism from an instrument of capitalism into an instrument of socialism". [95]

Essence = something that is or exists.
Ethics = the system of or code of morals of a particular philosopher, religion, group, profession, etc.

Lenin's postulates on the essence of communist ethics and on the ways to morally educate the working people under socialism remain relevant to this day. In a number of works he wrote before the October Revolution, as well as in numerous speeches made after it, Lenin disclosed the essence of ethics as a special form of social consciousness guided by the objective laws of historical development. At the same time, he emphasised, particularly in his well-known report "The Tasks of the Youth Leagues" at the Third Young Communist League Congress, that communist ethics was a mighty weapon in the struggle for socialism and communism. His postulate on the criterion of communist ethics—that which is moral, is that which promotes the communist cause—reveals the subject-matter and principal features of the ethical ideal of a socialist society, and how a communist consciousness should be imparted to its members.

And, finally, a growing importance attaches today to Lenin's postulates on the unity of knowledge and assessment, on the essence of value relations in society.

We have considered the main problems to reveal the vast importance of Leninism today. Over recent decades, it should be noted, Marxist philosophical literature has been supplemented with several works which demonstrate the relevance of Lenin's philosophical ideas to specific directions in Marxist philosophical knowledge.[96] All these works prove that Lenin's ideas are alive, that they are being developed, enriched and applied in practice. The Leninist stage in Marxist philosophy has not ended with Lenin's death. His disciples and followers in all communist parties throughout the world are promoting his cause both in the practical matters of world socialism and in the theory of Marxism. Today Leninism is more and more becoming the world's most powerful ideological force.

Lenin's ideas have been given a new impetus in the documents of the international conferences of the communist and workers' parties and the congresses of the CPSU and fraternal communist parties, and in the documents of the CC CPSU, documents dealing with the problems of ideology and social life in a developed socialist society. In his speech at the 24th CPSU Congress, Leonid Brezhnev said: "As an eternally living and developing teaching, Leninism has been, remains and will be the crux of the

Party's ideological life, and the foundation of all its revolutionary, transformative activity. While drawing on Lenin's ideological legacy, the Party holds that its cardinal task is to find solution to pressing problems of communist construction on the basis of Lenin's ideas and Lenin's methodology." [97] In the documents of the 25th CPSU Congress this description of Leninism's relevance today was extended and added to: "The CPSU has based its effort in communist education, like the whole of its revolutionary transformative activity, on the sound foundation of Marxist-Leninist theory. Marxism-Leninism is the only reliable basis for formulating the right strategy and tactics. It gives us an understanding of the historical perspective, helps us to determine the lines of our socio-economic and political development for years ahead, and correctly to find our orientation in international developments. Marxism-Leninism derives its power from its constant and creative development. That is what Marx taught. That is what Lenin taught. Our Party will always be loyal to their precepts!" [98]

Marxist philosophical science at the Leninist stage has made a great contribution to the theoretical arsenal of communism and to the practice of socialist construction and the entire world revolutionary process, a contribution that features the main line of development of human knowledge as a whole. Leninism has been firmly established as the scientific philosophical foundation for the contemporary revolutionary development of society, as the most attractive and authoritative ideological force of progressive humankind. Marxist-Leninist philosophy today is a living source of revolutionary thought and action. It provides those fighting for communism and social progress with the only correct theory and method for achieving their great cause.

In 1980, all progressively-minded humankind marked the 110th anniversary of Lenin's birth. The CPSU Central Committee Resolution "On the 110th Anniversary of Lenin's Birth" emphasised the essence of Leninist ideas and their significance today. Part of it reads: "Lenin's teaching on imperialism, on socialist revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat, on the Party, the proletariat's class allies in its struggle for democracy and socialism, the indissoluble link between social emancipation and national liberation, as well as the principles of peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems, has become an

invaluable ideological theoretical and methodological weapon for revolutionaries in all countries. Vitally important are his ideas on the defence of the socialist homeland. The science he created on the ways of socialist and communist development is the acme of his theoretical legacy." [99]

A far-reaching assessment of Leninism's theoretical essence and its growing importance for modern social progress is contained in the works of Leonid Brezhnev and other leaders of the CPSU and the Soviet state, and in those written by many of the outstanding leaders of the fraternal communist parties throughout the world.

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the entire Soviet people, as well as the fraternal countries of the world socialist community, base their activities on the solid foundation of Lenin's ideas which they creatively develop, while applying them to the practical matters that arise in contemporary social development.

The 26th CPSU Congress, which took place in February-March 1981, made a new creative contribution to the philosophical ideas of Leninism. It emphasised once again the historical truth of Lenin's teaching on the dialectics of contemporary world development. The sphere of imperialist domination shrinked further during the 1970s, while the internal contradictions in capitalist countries and the rivalry between them intensified. Development of economics, social relations and culture in socialist countries continued at a rapid pace, along with the stabilisation and consolidation of their internal and external ties, and cooperation between them. Extension of ties and contacts among all the peoples of the world is typical for this period. "Relations between states have been called international since old days. But it is only in our time, in the socialist world that they have truly become relations between nations." [100] The above once again confirms the historical truth of Leninism and its teaching on the invincibility of humanity's advance along the road of social progress, towards socialism.

Revealing the intrinsic dialectics of developed socialist society, the 26th CPSU Congress emphasised the unity of economic and social tasks in its evolution towards communism. "The problems of economic management," said Leonid Brezhnev, "are not just economic, but political, Party problems." [101] It has been clearly manifested at the stage

of developed socialism: "The interrelation of economic progress with socio-political and cultural progress grows ever closer under the conditions of mature socialism." [102] Here, too, Lenin's propositions on the unity of the economic, political and cultural development of society and its science-based guidance, are confirmed historically.

In the first years of Soviet power, Lenin devoted much space in his theoretical works to an increased role of science and its merger with practice under socialism. The 26th CPSU Congress creatively elaborated these propositions, drawing on the experience of recent decades. Speaking at the Congress, Leonid Brezhnev emphasised that "building up a new society without science is simply inconceivable".[103] He described the dialectical unity of science and practice in developed socialist society, where a great effort on the part of scholars is required to fulfil practical tasks. At the same time, "science itself should be a constant 'trouble-maker', pointing to the areas where there are signs of stagnation and backwardness, where the present level of knowledge could secure faster and more successful advancement". [104] The Congress demonstrated that "the close integration of science and production is an imperative of the contemporary epoch". [105]

It is well known that Lenin attached great importance to the "human factor" in the development and administration of a new society. This issue was creatively elaborated at the 26th CPSU Congress. Leonid Brezhnev noted that the questions of Lenin's style in work occupy an important place in the life of developed socialist society: "What is meant here is the evolution of a style of work that would organically combine efficiency and discipline with bold initiative and enterprise; a practical and businesslike grasp, with a dedication to lofty goals; a critical attitude to shortcomings, with implicit faith in the historical advantages of the path we have chosen." [106] Lenin's ideas remain a solid theoretical foundation for solving all these problems in developed socialist society. "The Marxist-Leninist party cannot fulfil its role if it does not give due attention to putting into proper perspective all that is taking place, to generalising new phenomena, to *creatively developing Marxist-Leninist theory.*" [107] As society advances towards communism, Leninism displays ever new aspects that help fulfil contemporary theoretical and practical social tasks. Len-

in's teaching becomes increasingly relevant for contemporary socialism and for mankind's development along the road of peace, democracy and social progress.

---

[1] V. I. Lenin, "On the Significance of Militant Materialism", *Collected Works,* Vol. 33, p. 234.
[2] V. I. Lenin, "The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky", *Collected Works,* Vol. 28, p. 323.
[3] V. I. Lenin, "The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky", *Collected Works,* Vol. 28, p. 323.
[4] *Lenin Miscellany XI,* Moscow, Leningrad, 1929, p. 357 (in Russian).
[5] V. I. Lenin, "Eighth Congress of the R.C.P.(B.). March 18-23, 1919", *Collected Works,* Vol. 29, pp. 156-157.
[6] V. I. Lenin, "The Trade Unions, the Present Situation and Trotsky's Mistakes", *Collected Works,* Vol. 32, p. 27-28.
[7] V. I. Lenin, "The Immediate Tasks of the Soviet Government", *Collected Works,* Vol. 27, pp. 273-274.
[8] See V. I. Lenin, "Once Again on the Trade Unions, the Current Situation and the Mistakes of Trotsky and Bukharin", *Collected Works,* Vol. 32, p. 94.
[9] V. I. Lenin, "A Great Beginning", *Collected Works,* Vol. 29, p. 421.
[10] V. I. Lenin, "Our Foreign and Domestic Position and the Tasks of the Party", *Collected Works,* Vol. 31, p. 419.
[11] *Ibid.,* p. 420.
[12] Voluntary work on days-off without remuneration.
[13] V. I. Lenin, "'Left-Wing Communism'—an Infantile Disorder", *Collected Works,* Vol. 31, pp. 103-104.
[14] *Ibid.,* pp. 80-81.
[15] V. I. Lenin, "The Tasks of the Youth Leagues", *Collected Works,* Vol. 31, p. 287.
[16] *Ibid.,* p. 289.
[17] V. I. Lenin, "To Y. M. Krzhizhanovsky", *Collected Works,* Vol. 35, p. 435.
[18] V. I. Lenin, "Integrated Economic Plan", *Collected Works,* Vol. 32, p. 140.
[19] V. I. Lenin, "In Reply to Questions Put by a Correspondent of the *Daily Express*", *Collected Works,* Vol. 30, p. 368.
[20] V. I. Lenin, "The Eighth All-Russia Congress of Soviets, December 22-29, 1920", *Collected Works,* Vol. 31, p. 518.
[21] V. I. Lenin, "Notes on Electrification", *Collected Works,* Vol. 42, p. 280.
[22] V. I. Lenin, "On Polytechnical Education", *Collected Works,* Vol. 36, p. 534.
[23] K. Marx, F. Engels, *On the Paris Commune,* Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1976, p. 139.
[24] *Ibid.,* p. 162.
[25] V. I. Lenin, "Our Revolution", *Collected Works,* Vol. 33, pp. 478-480.
[26] V. I. Lenin, "On the Significance of Militant Materialism", *Collected Works,* Vol. 33, p. 227.

[27] *Ibid.*, p. 233.

[28] V. I. Lenin, "On the Significance of Militant Materialism", *Collected Works,* Vol. 33, p. 234.

[29] *Ibid.*, p. 229.

[30] *Smena Vekh* was an ideological and political trend which arose in the Left wing of the Cadet Party after the defeat of the counter-revolution in the Civil War (1917-1921). Its leaders—N. Ustryalov, a historian, Yu. Klyuchnikov, a lawyer, among others—called upon Russian intellectuals to work for Soviet power, i.e. to change its "landmarks" (*vekhi* in Russian) to the aims which had determined counter-revolutionary action in previous years (articles printed in the *Vekhi* collection, etc.). The Smena Vekh people hoped that mass participation of bourgeois intellectuals in the work of Soviet bodies would cause Soviet power to evolve in the direction of capitalism. Lenin revealed the class positions of the Smena Vekh people at the 11th Congress of the Party, yet he advised Communists to make use of their call to bourgeois experts to work in the economy.

[31] V. I. Lenin, "What Is to Be Done?", *Collected Works,* Vol. 5, p. 464.

[32] V. I. Lenin, "Speech Delivered at an All-Russia Conference of Political Education Workers of Gubernia and Uyezd Education Departments. November 3, 1920", *Collected Works,* Vol. 31, p. 372.

[33] V. I. Lenin, "Speech at a Meeting of the Communist Group in the All-Russia Central Council of Trade Unions, March 15, 1920", *Collected Works,* Vol. 36, p. 521.

[34] V. I. Lenin, "Better Fewer, but Better", *Collected Works,* Vol. 33, p. 494.

[35] V. I. Lenin, "Marxism and Insurrection", *Collected Works,* Vol. 26, p. 27.

[36] See Karl Marx, *Grundrisse der Kritik der politischen Ökonomie.* Verlag für Fremdsprachige Literatur, Moscow, 1939, p. 13.

[37] V. I. Lenin, "Philosophical Notebooks", *Collected Works,* Vol. 38, p. 187.

[38] *Ibid.*, p. 189.

[39] This principle was formulated by Niccolo Machiavelli, the 16th century politician, who proclaimed the "right" of feudal rulers to use any means to achieve the end. Later this principle was taken up by the most reactionary bourgeois theorists.

[40] Frederick Engels, *Anti-Dühring,* Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1975, p. 137.

[41] V. I. Lenin, "What the 'Friends of the People' Are and How They Fight the Social-Democrats", *Collected Works,* Vol. 1, p. 165.

[42] V. I. Lenin, "The Second Congress of the Communist International July 19.-August 7, 1920", *Collected Works,* Vol. 31, p. 232.

[43] V. I. Lenin, "The Immediate Tasks of the Soviet Government", *Collected Works,* Vol. 27, p. 274.

[44] V. I. Lenin, "Letter to the Congress", *Collected Works,* Vol. 36, p. 596.

[45] V. I. Lenin, "Original Version of the Article 'The Immediate Tasks of the Soviet Government' ", *Collected Works,* Vol. 42, p. 71.

[46] See F. Engels, *The Peasant War in Germany,* Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1965, pp. 21-23.

[47] V. I. Lenin, "Once Again on the Trade Unions, the Current

Situation and the Mistakes of Trotsky and Bukharin", *Collected Works*, Vol. 32, p. 83.

[48] *On Further Improving the Ideological, Political and Educational Work. Resolution of the CPSU Central Committee of April 26, 1979*, Moscow, 1979, p. 3 (in Russian).

[49] See V. I. Lenin, "Once Again on the Trade Unions, the Current Situation and the Mistakes of Trotsky and Bukharin", *Collected Works*, Vol. 32, p. 94.

[50] V. I. Lenin, "From a Publicist's Diary", *Collected Works*, Vol. 26, p. 52.

[51] *Pravda*, December 1, 1920.

[52] A draft copy of this document with Lenin's marks in the relevant paragraph is stored in the Central Party Archives at the CC CPSU Institute of Marxism-Leninism, 17/60/43.

[53] *The CPSU in Resolutions...*, Part I, Moscow, 1953, p. 784 (in Russian).

[54] J. V. Stalin, "The Foundations of Leninism. *Lectures Delivered at the Sverdlov University*", *Collected Works*, Vol. 6, Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, 1953, p. 73.

[55] M. I. Kalinin, *Over the Years*, Book 2, Moscow, Leningrad, 1926, p. 240 (in Russian).

[56] See *The CPSU in the Resolutions...*, Part I, p. 877.

[57] See Y. M. Yaroslavsky, *The Great Leader of the Working-Class Revolution—V. I. Ulyanov-Lenin*, Moscow, 1918; M. S. Olminsky, "Lenin", *Vestnik Zhizni* (Life's Herald), No. 2, 1918; V. I. Nevsky, *V. I. Ulyanov (Lenin)*, Moscow, 1920; V. V. Adoratsky, "Marxist Dialectics in Lenin's Works", *Proletarskaya Revolutsia* (Proletarian Revolution), No. 2, 1923, etc. (all in Russian).

[58] For instance, *What Should Be Read of Lenin's Works and How to Read Them*, Moscow, 1924 (in Russian).

[59] K. Kautsky, *Die Diktatur des Proletariats*, Vienna, 1918, p. 13.

[60] K. Kautsky, *Die Diktatur des Proletariats*, Vienna, 1918, p. 35.

[61] K. Kautsky, *Terrorismus und Kommunismus*, Berlin, 1919, p. 115.

[62] V. I. Lenin, "The Historical Meaning of the Inner-Party Struggle in Russia", *Collected Works*, Vol. 16, p. 391.

[63] See V. I. Lenin, "Letter to the Congress", *Collected Works*, Vol. 36, p. 595.

[64] K. Korsch, *Marxism and Philosophy*, Moscow, 1924, p. 36 (in Russian).

[65] *Ibid.*, p. 34.

[66] *Ibid.*, p. 51.

[67] See *Granat Encyclopaedia*, 7th ed., Vol. 40, p. 607 (in Russian).

[68] *Mesaventures de l'anti-marxisme. Les malheurs de M. Merleau-Ponti. Avec une lettre de Georg Lukács*, Editions sociales, Paris, 1956, pp. 158-59.

[69] V. I. Lenin, "*Kommunismus*. Journal of the Communist International for the Countries of South-Eastern Europe", *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 165.

[70] *Vestnik Kommunisticheskoi Akademii* (Herald of the Communist Academy), Book 10, p. 66 (in Russian).

[71] *Lenin Miscellany*, Vol. IX, p. 3 (in Russian).

[72] A. I. Deborin, *Lenin the Thinker*, Moscow, 1929, p. 12 (in Russian).

[73] *Disagreements in Philosophy,* Moscow, Leningrad, 1931, p. 279 (in Russian).

[74] See *On Partisanship in the Soviet Press,* Moscow, 1954, p. 406 (in Russian).

[75] *Ibid.,* p. 407.

[76] *Dialectical and Historical Materialism,* Part I, Moscow, 1934 (in Russian).

[77] See Bibliography.

[78] See Bibliography.

[79] *Dialectical and Historical Materialism,* Moscow, 1932, Part II, *Historical Materialism* (in Russian).

[80] *The Founder of Scientific Communism,* Moscow, 1968, pp. 15-16 (in Russian).

[81] *The Centenary of Lenin's Birth. Theses of the CPSU Central Committee,* Moscow, 1969, p. 5 (in Russian).

[82] Prominent among these are *Leninism and Contemporary Philosophical Problems,* Moscow, Mysl Publishers, 1970; *Lenin the Philosopher,* Moscow, Mysl Publishers, 1970; *The Leninist Stage in Marxist Philosophy,* Moscow, Nauka Publishers, 1972; *The History of Marxist Dialectics. The Leninist Stage,* Moscow, Mysl Publishers, 1973 (all in Russian). For more information see Bibliography.

[83] *Leninism and Contemporary Philosophical Problems,* Mysl Publishers, Moscow, 1970, p. 16 (in Russian).

[84] See V. I. Lenin, "The Agrarian Programme of Social-Democracy in the First Russian Revolution, 1905-1907", *Collected Works,* Vol. 13, pp. 244-245.

[85] V. I. Lenin, "Notes on Plekhanov's Second Draft Programme", *Collected Works,* Vol. 6, p. 54.

[86] See the next chapter.

[87] V. I. Lenin, "Conspectus of Hegel's Book *The Science of Logic*", *Collected Works,* Vol. 38, pp. 187-188.

[88] See V. I. Lenin, "Speech at a Plenary Session of the Moscow Soviet, November 20, 1922", *Collected Works,* Vol. 33, pp. 439-440.

[89] See V. I. Lenin, "Speech at a Joint Session of the All-Russia Central Executive Committee, the Moscow Soviet and All-Russia Trade Union Congress. January 17, 1919", *Collected Works,* Vol. 28, p. 393.

[90] *Ibid.,* p. 394.

[91] See V. I. Lenin, "What the 'Friends of the People' Are and How They Fight the Social-Democrats", *Collected Works,* Vol. 1, p. 159.

[92] V. I. Lenin, "Telegram to P. F. Vinogradov", *Collected Works,* Vol. 44, p. 80.

[93] V. I. Lenin, "Third Congress of the Communist International", *Collected Works,* Vol. 32, p. 477.

[94] V. I. Lenin, "Third All-Russia Congress of Soviets of Workers', Soldiers' and Peasants' Deputies. January 10-18 (23-31), 1918", *Collected Works,* Vol. 26, pp. 481-482.

[95] V. I. Lenin, "Speech at the First Congress of Economic Councils, May 26, 1918", *Collected Works,* Vol. 27, p. 412.

[96] See Bibliography.

[97] L. I. Brezhnev, *Following Lenin's Course. Speeches and Articles,* Moscow, Progress Publishers, 1972, pp. 438-439.

[98] L. I. Brezhnev, *Report of the CPSU Central Committee and the*

Immediate Tasks of the Party in Home and Foreign Policy, February 24, 1976, Moscow, Novosti Press Agency Publishing House, 1976, p. 127.

[99] *Pravda*, December 16, 1979.

[100] L. I. Brezhnev, *Report of the Central Committee of the CPSU to the XXVI Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Immediate Tasks of the Party in Home and Foreign Policy*, p. 10.

[101] L. I. Brezhnev, *Report of the Central Committee of the CPSU to the XXVI Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Immediate Tasks of the Party in Home and Foreign Policy*, p. 90.

[102] *Ibid.*, p. 92.

[103] *Ibid.*, p. 75.

[104] L. I. Brezhnev, *Report of the Central Committee of the CPSU to the XXVI Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union...*, p. 75.

[105] *Ibid.*, p. 77.

[106] *Ibid.*, p. 90.

[107] *Ibid.*, p. 138.

CHAPTER IV

The Current Ideological Struggle Over Lenin's Philosophical Legacy

1. Leninism and 20th-century Bourgeois Philosophy

As was mentioned above, early in this century bourgeois philosophers dismissed Leninism as a doctrine apparently without a philosophical foundation of its own. Nevertheless, as the ideas of Leninism spread, and all the progressive sections of society rallied towards them, it became increasingly obvious that this unscientific position was completely untenable. As early as the late 1930s, bourgeois philosophers began to cultivate their own interpretation of the philosophical principles of Leninism thereby seeking to prevent any further spread of its influence in world social thought. This tendency became especially marked after World War II, in which the Soviet Union demonstrated its might in every area of the life of society. An even greater stimulus for the growth of this tendency was the emergence of the world socialist system which speeded up the collapse of the world colonial system and the emergence of a large group of young national states in Asia, Africa and Latin America, setting out on the non-capitalist path of development.

In the latter half of the 1940s, a number of works by bourgeois philosophers and sociologists appeared, aimed at giving their own assessment of Leninism. These include *The Russian Idea* by N. Berdyaev (1946), *A History of Russian Philosophy* by V. Zenkovsky (1948), *History of Russian Philosophy* by N. Lossky (1951), and *Von Bakunin zu Lenin. Geschichte der russischen Revolutionären*

Ideologien. 1840-1895 (From Bakunin to Lenin. The History of Russian Revolutionary Ideology. 1840-1895) by P. Scheibert (1956).

These books contained views distorting the essence of Leninism as a philosophical theory. N. Lossky, for example, in his *History of Russian Philosophy,* set out to prove that Leninism was merely a kind of mechanistic materialism, something akin to the views of the 18th-century French thinkers. Another idealist, N. Berdyaev, reproached Leninism for being metaphysical and for denying man's ability for activity and creativity. Highly typical of this "wave" of bourgeois attacks on Leninism was also a tendency to represent it as a regional, Russian theory. Berdyaev, for example, sought to show that Lenin had produced a system of ideas that replaced, as far as the peoples of Russia were concerned, the Christian religion, compromised in the course of the Russian revolution. It was an attempt to tear Leninism away from Marxism and to represent it as a new religion. These philosophers tried to link Leninism to the left Narodist current in Russia at the close of the 19th century. Thus, many of them linked the ideas of Leninism to the left anarchist currents of the followers of Bakunin, Tkachev, and even the terrorist Nechayev.

In the early 1950s, these works gained some prominence, being promoted in every way in the Western bourgeois press as "objective studies" of Leninism. Today, however, they are only remembered when analysing the ideological struggle over the philosophical questions of Leninism.

The struggle against Leninism was subsequently joined by more sizable forces of bourgeois philosophy. In the early 1950s and 1960s, a number of works on Leninism were published in the West by the fairly well-known leaders of certain traditional idealist schools, such as the neo-Thomists Joseph Bocheński and Gustav Wetter, the phenomenologist Maurice Merleau-Ponty, the positivist Karl Popper, the pragmatist Sidney Hook and such notorious anti-communists as Raymond Aron, Klaus Mehnert, Alfred Meyer, and others.

One of the first to start was J. Bocheński. (In the 1950s and 1960s he published 10 or so books on Leninism and Soviet philosophical studies.) His first book on philosophi-

cal science in the Soviet Union was entitled *Der sowjetrussische dialectische Materialismus (Diamat)* [Soviet Russian Dialectical Materialism (Diamat)] and published in 1950 in Bern. In this voluminous book he tried to give his own interpretation of the theoretical sources and scope of the philosophical ideas of Leninism. For Bocheński, Leninism originated from three principal sources—Hegel's philosophy, Marx's social theory, and the materialism of the Russian philosophers of the latter half of the 19th century or, as Bocheński calls them, the Russian "nihilists". Certainly Bocheński did not even attempt to quote any facts to bear out this interpretation of his. He merely laid down this scheme, passing over in complete silence, for example, the ideas Lenin expressed in *The Three Sources and Three Component Parts of Marxism.*

Bocheński merely alleged, without furnishing any proof, that Leninism consisted of three basic components—the materialism of the "nihilists" (Chernyshevsky, Herzen, etc.), Hegel's dialectics, and the social theory of Marx. Therefore Leninism, as depicted by Bocheński, is not a whole but a mechanical conglomeration of heterogeneous elements in no way connected with one another.

Bocheński decided to determine the main periods in the development of Leninism. In his view, each of these periods had a "determining force" in some specific individual. Significantly, as he describes the periods in the development of Leninism, Bocheński names everybody except Lenin. At the beginning, he says, the development of Leninism was determined by the ideas of Trotsky, and later, Bukharin, Deborin, Stalin, Zhdanov, and so on. Thus if we are to believe him, Lenin's ideas were developed in each period by one personality or another (not, by any means, by Lenin himself), and every new landmark in this development involved the "elimination" of the preceding leader. The unsoundness of this scheme hardly needs to be proved. It is therefore not surprising that in spite of all the advertising and promotion they received in the Western press, Bocheński's ideas had no success with the general public in the Western countries.

Bocheński's ideas on Leninism and 20th-century Marxist philosophy were shared and propagated by the neo-Thomist Gustav Wetter, a Jesuit, who, in the early 1950s, published a still heftier composition, *Der dialektische Ma-*

terialismus. Seine Geschichte und sein System in der Sowjetunion (Dialectical Materialism. Its History and System in the Soviet Union). Wetter himself explains what his book is about: "In the proper philosophical general assessment of dialectical materialism we can agree with Bocheński's view, taking it further.... Dialectical materialism as a system is an eclectical mixture of the most diverse, often totally opposite philosophical positions." [1]

Similar pronouncements on Leninism were made by Maurice Merleau-Ponty. In 1955, he published his *Les aventures de la dialectique* (Adventures of the Dialectics) in which he writes that "dialectical relations become clear only when considered in our experience, in conjunction with the subject, being, and other subjects" [2]. This means that he interprets dialectics not as a science of the general objective laws to which the world is subject, but as a purely subjectivist theory. The gist of Marxist philosophy as a whole is interpreted by Merleau-Ponty as an "expression of affinity between the individual and the external world, between subject and object". [3] This is clearly indicative of the idea of an idealistic conception of fundamental coordination, which was subjected to in-depth analysis and criticism by Lenin in his *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism.* Speaking of socialist revolution, Merleau-Ponty argues that it is anti-dialectical since "there is no dialectics without opposition". His main idea is that "revolutions are true as movements and false as regimes". [4] It is not hard to see that all of Merleau-Ponty's efforts are aimed at representing Leninism (both as a theory and in practice) as "inconsistent" with dialectics, which he treats in a subjectivist way. Therefore, he concludes, Marxism-Leninism is metaphysical.

The writings of Bocheński, Wetter, Merleau-Ponty and others did not significantly contribute in any way to achieving the principal objective set by bourgeois philosophers in the latter half of the 20th century. This was to belittle, distort, and hinder the spread and ideological influence of Leninism in the modern world. They were given a fitting rebuff by Marxist authors. Yet, as regards a general assessment of the ideological struggle waged in bourgeois philosophy against Leninism, these efforts remain a typical example of bourgeois ideology in its inability to falsify the fundamental tenets of Marxist-Leninist philosophy.

Yet another example of such falsifications of Marxist-Leninist philosophy is provided by the writings of one of the leaders of philosophical thought in the United States, formerly a Trotskyite and now a pragmatist, Sydney Hook. He has been trying for some years to evolve an alternative to Marxism-Leninism. His book *Marx and the Marxists* sets out, as do his other writings, to depict modern Marxist-Leninist thought as a complete negation of Marx's real views. Hook writes quite frankly that it was a grave historical and political mistake to let the Communists declare Marx their property, and that Marxism is one of the best points of view from which to criticise communism. [5] He claims that "where Marxism as a movement has triumphed, as in the Soviet Union, its socialist ideals have failed or have been betrayed; where it has failed as a movement, as in the West, its ideals have made considerable headway". [6] From these general statements follows his attitude to Leninism which he believes is not related to Marxism but is rather a kind of positivism. And the main figure to formulate its principles was, according to Hook, not Lenin but Trotsky. [7] The aim of this and all similar arguments is to oppose Marxism and Leninism, the theory and practice of communism. These attempts all had the same fate as those of the neo-Thomists: after being sensationalised for a short time they are completely forgotten, and the search for new ways to fight Marxism-Leninism is resumed.

One of such "new" ways to fight Marxist-Leninist philosophy was the attack taken up by the neo-positivists. After the Machists, the neo-positivists tried to interpret the objective in science in purely idealistic terms.

Supporters of this school tried repeatedly to provide an alternative to Marxism-Leninism, especially to the materialist conception of history. Thus, a major neo-positivist, K. Popper, has declared that any knowledge of the future from the position of science is impossible. Following Kant, he depicts the development of social knowledge as a mere description of facts, denying that it is possible to disclose their relationship and interdependence. History, Popper said, is meaningless. Another representative of this school, A. Ayer, maintained that Marxist-Leninist thought was at a deadlock precisely because it tried to discover the logical relationship between historical events.

The Marxist philosophers of the Soviet Union, the fraternal socialist countries and the countries of the capitalist system have made a critical assessment of these attacks on their philosophical positions. But in the final analysis they have been disproved by history itself, the very course of which shows irrefutably that the ideas of Marx and Lenin are true, being invariably borne out by mankind's social practice as a whole. By virtue of this, the attacks launched by Berdyaev, Bocheński, Hook and their ilk against Leninism can be considered mere episodes leaving no perceptible trace behind them.

A more subtle, and, consequently, more dangerous attack on Marxism-Leninism was undertaken in recent decades by representatives of the idealist philosophical school, perhaps the most influential in European theoretical thought after the war. We refer to the philosophy of existentialism. Exponents of this trend hold differing views. We find among them such champions of religion as Karl Jaspers and Gabriel Marcel, and such adherents of the "atheistic" trend as Jean Paul Sartre and Simone de Beauvoir.

The social positions of existentialism are also rather mixed. Among the existentialists there are those who support naked reaction (Martin Heidegger) and those who try to defend the ideas of the struggle for peace (in abstract humanitarian terms)—Sartre, Jaspers, and others. Yet, as far as their attitude to Marxism and Lenin's philosophical ideas is concerned, they are united. They oppose the teaching of Marx and Lenin on the possibility of knowing the social process and man's omnipotence in his world-transforming activity, with a eulogy of the subconscious and intuitional principles in the life of man, whom they regard as a "social atom" existing separately from, and in a relation of eternal dread to, society.

Granted, some existentialists declare their "positive" attitude to dialectical materialism. Thus, in his *Critique de la raison dialectique* (1960) (Criticism of Dialectical Reason) Sartre said that his socio-political theory could be well combined with Marxism and was "not directed against" it.[8] The unscientific nature of this doctrine does not change because of such declarations. Existentialism objectively expresses the views of capitalist philosophic reaction, and as such it is one of the overt opponents of the philosophy of Marx and Lenin.

Among the bourgeois philosophers and sociologists of the latter half of the 20th century there are some whose activities have been devoted to distorting and falsifying Marxist-Leninist philosophy. These include the already mentioned R. Aron (France), K. Mehnert (FRG), and A. Meyer (USA).

Raymond Aron emerged in the late 1950s as one of the principal authors of the so-called "industrial society" theory, conceived as an alternative to the Marxist conception of history. In a course of lectures on the development of industrial society and social stratification, delivered at the Sorbonne, he declared this theory to be a way out of the socialism-capitalism conflict.[9] For Aron, the development of society does not depend on social contradictions, but merely on technical and economic indicators. It follows from his reasoning that all industrialised countries, irrespective of the nature of ownership prevailing in them, move in the same direction and inevitably converge into a uniform type of society. This has given rise to what is known as convergence theory, which the modern anti-communists want to see instead of the Marxist-Leninist theory of the historical process. They seek to prove that the progress of society does not consist at all in moving from capitalism to socialism, but merely in the development of society's technical facilities on the basis of which all the forms of social life—socialist and capitalist—must "converge".

This theory stands out in the anti-communist ideology of our times. As a criterion of social progress it puts forward not ideal but entirely material principles, i.e. the development of technology. There have also emerged later versions of this conception—the so-called "consumer society" (W. Rostow), the "post-industrial society" (R. Aron and D. Bell), the "technotronic society" (Z. Brzezinski), and so forth. In Western sociology these theories have subsequently became known under the common name of "technological determinism", i.e. the level of social development depends on that of the development of technology. Still, the common idealistic nature of the socio-philosophic principles of all these theories has remained the same. As Marx and Lenin showed, one-sided emphasis on the role of technology, without due account of the production, social and political relations that emerge on the basis of technology, is nothing but sophistical and eclectic.

Closely related to these theories is yet another anti-Marxist concept which was loudly proclaimed in the 1950s and 1960s. This is the so-called "de-ideologisation" theory originated by R. Aron, D. Bell and certain followers of the "functional school" in bourgeois sociology—Seymour Lipset, Henry Aiken and others. This theory announced the "end of ideology" in the 20th century. Its authors asserted that ideology, as a means of dealing with social problems in industrially advanced countries (irrespective of their socio-political systems), is no longer of importance to the life of society. This is apparently associated with the penetration of science into every area of social life (let us recall that bourgeois social thought used to invest the notion of ideology with a content which allegedly contrasted with science as some sort of "false conscience"). Ideology as a special kind of intellectual activity supposedly outlives its usefulness in the age of the technological revolution. Actually, the proponents of this theory admit the impotence and weakness of their own ideological doctrines, extrapolating their assessments of ideology back to the ideological life of society as a whole. The point of these assessments lies in an attempt to extend them also to the theory of Marxism-Leninism, above all, to Lenin's assessment of social development in the 20th century.

The "de-ideologisation" theory was given wide publicity in the Western press. Soon, however, its sterility was admitted even by its own authors, and towards the end of the 1960s they began to speak of the beginning of the "re-ideologisation" of social development at the turn of the 1970s. "Re-ideologisation" in this case stands for the restoration of the allegedly lost importance of ideology in society.

The socio-political implication of this reasoning is plain enough. It suggests that Marxism-Leninism has allegedly lost its significance for contemporary social development, while "re-ideologisation" is the re-creation of ideology on a non-class foundation. Epistemologically it is neither more nor less than a pretension to substantiating a "third" way in ideology, to demagogically setting off a sort of "universal" or "general humanitarian" trend against contrasting the two diametrically opposite ideologies now in existence—the bourgeois and the proletarian.

Back in *What Is To Be Done?* Lenin gave a fitting rebuff

to attempts to find a "third" ideological way. In the struggle of ideas, Lenin wrote, there can be no middle way: there is either bourgeois or socialist ideology. Attempts by modern bourgeois philosophers and sociologists to revive long-buried myths concerning the possibility of such a "third" way in fact imply yet another move by anti-communism in its striving to stem the mounting influence of Marxist-Leninist ideas in the world today.

It is also worth mentioning the frankly anti-communist theories assiduously propagated by the contemporary spiritual apologists of capitalism. More often than not, anti-communism today treats various aspects of Soviet life and the development of the Soviet Union in the context of so-called Sovietology. One of the most representative examples of this can be found in the writings of the West German Sovietologist Klaus Mehnert. His books *Der Sowjetmensch* (Soviet Man) and *Peking und Moskau* claim that neither the October Revolution nor the subsequent development of socialism in the USSR are a realisation of Marx's ideas. The main facts in the history of the post-October development of the Soviet Union are, according to Mehnert, the "habit of religious faith" and an "absence of traditions of freedom".[10] Hence, communism, for him, is merely the voluntarism of certain individuals (Lenin in the first place), passively submitted to by the "uniformised" majority.

Another active anti-communist, the Sovietologist Alfred Meyer, also writes in the same vein. In his books, *Marxism* and *Leninism,* he declares that the dialectical materialist analysis of social development is unscientific because it is based on a "metaphysical" faith in progress. Social progress for Meyer is nothing but a myth, as man is essentially "eternal and immutable" throughout his history.[11] Carew Hunt, who holds the same views, claims that Marxist-Leninist theory, worked out by Lenin's disciples and followers, is characterised by voluntarism and subjectivism.[12]

One of the methods of criticising Leninism, most often applied by contemporary anti-communists, is to accuse it of "anti-humanism", "neglect of individual interests", "sacrificing the individual to the whole", and so on. Such inventions are the stock-in-trade of the contemporary bourgeois "champions of human rights" or, more precisely, of

the most recent current school of anti-communism speculating on such notions as the individual, freedom and humanism, interpreted in abstract terms. Grudging no black paint to depict the "suppression of freedoms" in the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, these writers pass over in silence the universally-known facts of violence and discrimination in the capitalist world. They condemn neither overt racism nor even naked genocide, like the crimes of the Pol Pot clique in Kampuchea. At the same time, they go out of their way to distort the socialist countries and the Marxist-Leninist world outlook.

In recent years, the ideologists of anti-communism have resorted to yet another trick in falsifying Marxism-Leninism. Their writings increasingly allege that Leninism is merely one of many trends in the development of 20th-century Marxist thought. This conception is known as the "pluralistic Marxism" theory. Its authors claim that since October 1917 Marxism has developed along different and often mutually exclusive lines, which usually include so-called "traditional" Marxism, i.e. the views and ideas of such right-wing Social-Democratic leaders as K. Kautsky and his more recent followers, Benedikt Kautsky, Bruno Kreisky, Willy Brandt and others. Accounted as "special" trends are Trotskyism, the Frankfurt School, the theories of Ernest Bloch, Georg Lukács, the Yugoslav Praxis group, etc.

The political purpose of such judgements is plain; they set out to belittle the significance of Leninism, placing it parallel to numerous other doctrines and so postulating that Marxism today has no single history or uniform ideological basis. This shows that all the attempts to attack Marxism-Leninism directly have failed to yield the results expected by their authors. Now they are trying to build upon a number of anti-Leninist ideological currents which, they hope, will help them to "blast" the monolithic communist world outlook from within.

The Marxist philosophers of the Soviet Union, the fraternal socialist countries and the world communist movement have given a resolute rebuff to all these attacks. They have shown how utterly unsound and speculative anti-communism and its philosophical upholders are.[13] In the course of this struggle a number of major problems in the philosophy of Marxism-Leninism were further developed.

Realised here was Lenin's direction that the main principle of criticising bourgeois philosophy must be a comparison between its basic theoretical premises and dialectical materialism in the totality of its fundamental problems and concepts. At the same time, an affinity was demonstrated, in the course of this criticism of anti-communism in philosophy, between different anti-Leninist writings and the most reactionary imperialist philosophical theories and their partisan, class nature, which reveals their social role as the means to militantly advocate a moribund social system, resting on the exploitation of the masses and striving to hold back the social development of mankind towards communism.

2. Leninism and Petty-Bourgeois Philosophical Currents

In 1920, in his *'Left-Wing' Communism—an Infantile Disorder* Lenin analysed the leftist errors of a sectarian group expelled from the Communist Party of Germany by its 2nd Congress. The group's ideas were set forth in a pamphlet, *The Split in the Communist Party of Germany,* published by a "local group in Frankfurt on Main". [14] The gist of their ideas was that the revolutionary break-up of the bourgeois state was impossible without the destruction of bourgeois democracy, and the destruction of the latter was impossible "without destroying parties". [15] Thereby the oppositionists were, in effect, recommending disbanding the Communist Party under the pretext of getting ready for the proletarian revolution. These calls were disguised with general declarations of the group's adherence to Marxism. Analysing the errors of this group, Lenin noted that "they consider themselves sound Marxists, but talk incredible nonsense in a most ridiculous manner and reveal their failure to understand the ABC of Marxism". [16] It was necessary for people of this persuasion to declare their adherence to Marxism because Marxism was fashionable among many bourgeois and petty-bourgeois writers in the early 1920s in Germany. But, Lenin pointed out: "Mere acceptance of Marxism does not save one from errors. We Russians know this especially well, because Marxism has very often been the 'fashion' in our country." [17]

Now it is hard to say who the "local group in Frank-

furt on Main" actually were. Yet, it is significant that the so-called Frankfurt School, which laid claim to its own understanding of Marxism, should have sprung up there in 1930. In the late 1920s a circle of radical petty-bourgeois intellectuals appeared in Frankfurt on Main. It included Max Horkheimer, Theodor Adorno and Herbert Marcuse, who claimed a "true understanding" of Marxism as a criticism of capitalist society from the standpoint of abstract humanism. They did not recognise Leninism as the general line of 20th-century Marxism, assessing the working-class movement merely as a passive force and seeing the main revolutionary force in those who embodied the intellectual force of the "critical spirit" in society, i.e. the intellectuals.

In 1930, Horkheimer headed the Institute for Social Studies, founded earlier within the University of Frankfurt. This is when the Frankfurt School is usually considered to have been established.

After Hitler came to power, the Frankfurt School left Germany, its principal members emigrating to the United States. After the war, Horkheimer and Adorno returned to Germany and re-opened the Frankfurt Institute for Social Studies (1950). The Institute was soon joined by the so-called second-generation members of the Frankfurt School—Jürgen Habermas, Alfred Schmidt, Oskar Negt, and others. At that period, they declared themselves to be "authentic Marxists", i.e. laid claim to their own "reading" of Marxism. They proclaimed their own special "Western" kind of Marxism, allegedly characteristic of the developed capitalist countries (as distinct from "East European Marxism", i.e. Leninism).

In their essence and content, the ideas of the Frankfurt School are the most typical petty-bourgeois distortion of Marxism and, accordingly are criticism of Leninism.

The anti-Leninist ideas of the Frankfurt School are set out in their most concentrated form in Adorno's *Negative Dialektik*. This book, which gives a general exposition of the views entertained by the Frankfurt neo-Marxists on the place and role of philosophy in society, also contains outspoken judgements on the development of Marxist philosophical thought in the Soviet Union, the socialist countries, and the world communist movement—i.e. on the Leninist stage of dialectical and historical materialism. It is

worth noting that Adorno (as well as other members of the Frankfurt School), eschews the notion of "Leninism", using instead such terms as "eastern Marxism", "diamat" etc. For Adorno, the purpose of philosophy is to criticise the existing conditions (as distinct from science, which searches for the truth). "Nothing positive," he writes, "can be got from philosophy." [18] Max Horkheimer wrote the same. "The true function of philosophy," he declared, "is to criticise the existing situation." [19] Criticism is what the Frankfurt School sees as the chief instrument of struggle against capitalism. This calls to mind Marx's well-known dictum that one must not confuse the weapons of criticism with criticism by weapons. [20] But these petty-bourgeois philosophers, claiming an "authentic reading" of Marx, could not care less for his real thoughts. In fact, in spite of constant references to Hegel, their positions are still those of neo-Kantian "ethical socialism," i.e. they see social progress as directly dependent on the self-perfection of certain individuals conceived apart from the unity and relation of the social whole.

Adorno also gives his own interpretation of dialectical materialism, i.e. Leninism. He declares that the word "dialectics" means nothing more than that things are not revealed in ideas about them. [21] For Adorno this means that dialectics is a purely subjective phenomenon, unrelated to the external material world. It is only in the activity of the subject or, more exactly, thinking, that the dialectics exists. Such is the conclusion drawn by the Frankfurt "Marxists" (or the distorters of Marxism as they should be called). From this it follows that all the work done on developing dialectical materialism by Marx and Engels in between the 1850s and 1880s, and by Lenin in the 20th century, is an error and the objectivity of the dialectics, revealed and proved by them, "does not exist".

Adorno dealt still more summarily with dialectical logic which Engels described as the science of the subjective dialectics of human thought. This "authentic" philosopher categorically asserts that dialectical logic appears more positivist than positivism itself. So Engels and Lenin were wrong again when they said that the subjective dialectics of thought reflects the objective dialectics of the material world. Dialectical analysis turns out to be merely the "totality of logical claims to see through self-infatuation". [22]

Indeed, Adorno sees criticism of existing situation first and foremost as criticism of human thought. As for the material world, it isn't even mentioned.

Well, not quite. As soon as Adorno has to say something about the much-disparaged capitalism, he deigns to define certain categories of the dialectics of objective development. Especially significant is his conception of antagonism. Antagonistic society, Adorno admits, has a beginning and an end. But "antagonism stops no more at society than suffering does".[23] So that's how it is! It appears that objective contradictions ensue from the biological principles allegedly lying at the basis of social processes. Here we have an unnatural marriage between subjectivism and biologising conceptions of society, which is pure idealistical metaphysics.

Adorno launches out with particular zeal against the Marxist-Leninist principle of the unity of theory and practice in philosophy and the theory of scientific communism. First he calls this principle a "negligible nuance of neo-Hegelianism" (!) by which, as it turns out, he means the "historically obsolete left Hegelianism".[24] It is unnecessary to dwell here on the sheer ideological confusion implied in these views. Adorno needs them merely to draw a still more astounding conclusion—that while the Western "authentic Marxists" have rid mankind of this pernicious idea, "in the East they cannot give up Marxist philosophy [i.e. Leninism—*L. S.*] because of their cultural zeal".[25] This means that the root and source of the great significance of Lenin's ideas in our age lie merely in the "cultural zeal" of the backward Eastern countries. It is true that further on Adorno forgets all about this "zeal" with which the backward East is consumed, and attacks the principle of the unity of theory and practice. He writes that "it was not long before the demand for the unity of practice and theory had reduced the latter to the status of a handmaiden", that the "visa of practice which is demanded [among Marxists-Leninists—*L. S.*] from every theory has become a censorship stamp", that in the unity of theory and practice, which exists in Marxist-Leninist thought, the "former has fallen and the latter has become a part of politics",[26] and so on. The point of this "anti-practice" escapade becomes plain when the authentic philosopher declares that "theory should win back its inde-

pendence, it is in the interests of practice itself".[27] What independence, one would like to know, does he mean? What are the "interests of practice" that the Frankfurt School is so touchingly anxious about? There can only be one answer. The "independence" of the theory they put forward means its separation from the needs and interests of the people, the working masses, the fighters for social progress. And the interests of practice mentioned by the authentic philosopher are obviously nothing but the perfectly down-to-earth interests of capitalism which has a stake in the ideological weakening of world socialism and the revolutionary process. This, in fact, is the true meaning of the "criticism" of the existing situation, i.e. of the capitalist world in which the Frankfurt School is perfectly comfortable.

The writings of Horkheimer, Adorno and Habermas can be viewed together in their criticism of Leninism, but two followers of the Frankfurt School, active in it in the early 1930s, at present hold a somewhat special position, so that their ideas merit a separate assessment. They are Herbert Marcuse and Erich Fromm.

After emigrating to the United States, Marcuse was an American inteligence officer during World War II, and an expert at the Russian Institute of Columbia University and the Russian Research Centre of Harvard University in the 1950s. He has been a professor at California University since 1965. Even in the 1930s and 1940s, Marcuse, unlike the orthodox followers of the Frankfurt School, tried to combine Hegelianism with neo-Freudism. In the 1950s he specialised in overt attacks on Leninism.[28] In the 1960s he was, for a short period, the ideological leader of the so-called New Left which united petty-bourgeois youth with left anarchist, Trotskyite and Maoist leanings. Marcuse's ideas, propounded by him between the 1930s and 1950s, did not attract the attention of the world philosophical community. He was one of the many opponents to Leninism who applied, by and large, the same methods as Adorno and others like him.

In the 1960s, the growth of contradictions in many developed capitalist countries—France, Italy, the USA, West Germany, etc.—activated students, who often supported the leftist negation of everything and were bent on destroying the bourgeois establishment. Marcuse's ideas, for-

mulated in his books *One-dimensional Man* (1964), *The End of Utopia* (1967) and *An Essay on Liberation* (1969) became fashionable amongst these leftist groups.

Marcuse's general conception is immediately related to the theory of a "single industrial society". He claimed that with the development of science and technology the once revolutionary working class is "integrated" into the system of capitalist relations, loses its revolutionary potentialities, and becomes a mass made up of "the one-dimensional man" who does not have a critical attitude either to the external conditions of existence or his own activity.

In this situation, the revolutionary social principle begins to be embodied in "outsiders", i.e. the lumpen-proletariat, the oppressed minorities, the jobless, and so on. It is worth noting that Marcuse includes among the "outsiders", as independent social groups, the intellectuals, young people, and even women as a historically deprived part of humanity. For Marcuse the revolutionary centre of world development shifts to the underdeveloped "poor" countries, equally hostile to capitalism and socialism. Proceeding from this premise, Marcuse called for a renunciation of the legal methods used to oppose capitalism and appealed to the radical elements for a rejection of their accustomed life styles, for their absolute denial.

At one time, this theory was known among its followers as "Ma-Ma-Ma-ism", deciphered as "Marx-Mao-Marcuse". There was, of course, no real connection whatsoever between Marcusianism and Marxism. It was just that Marcuse had tried to turn to account some of Marx's early statements on abstract notion of individual freedom, to which he had added Maoist ideas on the decisive significance of young people in the revolutionary destruction of the old, together with his own element of this theory, which related revolution to man's biological instincts in the Freudian sense.

Another characteristic of Marcusian theory was its militant anti-technicism. He called for the "liberation" of man from subjection to technology, abolishing not only the existing social patterns, but their material and technical basis as well. In the course of such abolition, he said, on the one hand, the real perceptible principles of human life, man's "true needs" must come to light; and, on the

other, the conditions would be created for thinking over the ways to achieve a truly human progress of society.

In the late 1960s, Marcuse's doctrine became fairly popular amongst students and intellectuals in many developed capitalist countries. In 1968, when major political events were underway in France and Italy, Marcuse came to Europe to expound his ideas in person to the students there. His listeners asked themselves what was the ultimate aim of his rejection. Marcuse's theory gave no explicit answer to this, nor could it give any. In saying that there would be time to think of this later on, he satisfied nobody. The popularity of Marcusianism rapidly declined. Marcuse died a few years later, as good as forgotten by his once so enthusiastic followers.

There is not the least doubt about the general anti-Leninist tenor of Marcuse's theories and his claim to provide a "super-radical" alternative to Marxism-Leninism. But the practice of revolutionary struggle in the modern world has clearly revealed the real ideological and social nature of Marcusianism as a petty-bourgeois social utopia, anarchic in its antecedents, and objectively a tool of bourgeois ideology in its struggle against scientific communism and its philosophical foundations.

Prominent among other petty-bourgeois theories of recent decades is that propounded by Erich Fromm. Like Marcuse, he was first a member of the Frankfurt School and then emigrated to the United States where he worked at many American universities and practised simultaneously as a psychoanalyst. In the 1960s Fromm published *Marx's Concept of Man* (1961), *Beyond the Chains of Illusion. My Encounter with Marx and Freud* (1962) and other books.

Fromm does not speak of Leninism directly. But his conception implies a silent exclusion of Leninism from the history of Marxist thought. And as far as Marx is concerned, Fromm takes the same a priori approach, ascribing his own abstract humanistic and biologising ideas of man and society to the great founder of the proletarian world outlook. Fromm's theory was, in fact, an attempt at investing a would-be revolutionary theory with existentialist ideas.

Borrowing his ideas on man's alienation under capitalism from the early Marx, Fromm suggested renouncing the

revolutionary struggle against capitalism. To do this, he said, one must establish what the true needs of a person are (treated by this philosopher, of course, out of the context of history and development). As a result, Fromm reduces all social contradictions to antinomy, i.e. the rational-irrational contradiction which can be overcome, above all, on the basis of "humanistic existentialism", thus, he approaches history as a true biologiser.

As concerns the practice of fighting social injustice, Fromm calls for developing a "communal socialism", i.e. separate, unrelated economic and family units within which "sound social relations" should be established. Fromm could not care less for either capitalism or socialism embodied in real form. His "communal" units are able to emerge and exist just anywhere, whatever the prevailing relations.

Fromm's ideas became popular in the 1960s—although much less than Marcuse's—among petty-bourgeois sections of society in several major capitalist countries. Certain anarchist and Maoist movements in various countries tried to make use of them. These ideas were undoubtedly an attempt to work out yet another alternative to Leninism, as a means of countering the latter's growing social significance and international recognition.

* * *

As we discussed anti-Leninist ideas in petty-bourgeois philosophy, we analysed the main ideas of certain philosophical schools and trends. This description of petty-bourgeois radicalism in its attempts to belittle and falsify the significance of Leninism would be incomplete without a description of the ideas held by the main political petty-bourgeois groups in the contemporary capitalist world.

In the history of our times, petty-bourgeois ideology finds expression in the activities of such groups as the anarchists, Trotskyites, Maoists, etc. Together, they are known as the New Left. The point is that between the 1920s and 1950s the traditional anarchist and Trotskyite movements suffered one political fiasco after another. As a result, all that remained of them at the start of the 1960s were a few disunited warring groups of their adepts.

In the 1960s, they were somewhat enlivened by the aggravation of contradictions both in the general social development of society and in the world revolutionary process. Hence these groups' activities directly related to the struggle of the ideological opponents of Leninism against the historic gains made in these years.

In the 1960s and 1970s, the New Left in the capitalist countries appeared under different guises. It included so-called "reformists" of a leftist hue, like Fromm's followers; adventurers of the French anarchist type, like Daniel Cohn-Bendit; and terrorist groups, like the notorious "Red Brigades" or the Baader-Meinhof gang. They are all joined in their common hostility towards the world communist movement and Marxism-Leninism. Politically, these groups are increasingly becoming a reserve and ally of the most reactionary sections of contemporary imperialism, carrying out its assignments.

Thus the pro-Maoist groups operating in various countries preach Peking's line of enmity to the Soviet Union and the world socialist community, preach ideas denying the integrity of the world revolutionary process, propagate nationalism and chauvinism and extol violence and hostility in international relations. The Maoist groups (often made up of just 20 to 30 members) which operate in capitalist countries are carrying on a noisy slanderous attack on Marxism-Leninism and its exponent—the communist movement which rests on the granite foundations of scientific communism.

Increasingly Maoism is growing into naked anti-Sovietism and a force ready to come to any compromise at all with imperialism in the name of the Peking leaders' chauvinist and hegemonistic aims. Hence, the current Leninist struggle implying both the ruthless exposure and criticism of Maoism, which has become one of the most reactionary trends of modern petty-bourgeois ideology.

As always, the Trotskyites try to seize leadership in the left extremist movements. Their efforts are blocked by the continuous internal squabbles which have marked this current ever since it began. There are today several international Trotskyite groups, each claiming to be the sole representative of the movement as a whole. At the same time, they have tried in a number of cases to form an alliance with the Maoists but, disliking Peking's attempts to

order them about, they are now charging the Maoists with "right-wing opportunism" and "counter-revolution".

Prominent among the petty-bourgeois ideological currents of today are anarchist groups which are divided into the so-called "traditional anarchists", or followers of Proudhon and Bakunin, and the "neo-anarchists", who are looking for "new paths". The latter are further subdivided by some writers into anarchist liberals, anarchist socialists and anarcho-Marxists.[29] The so-called "revolutionary terrorism", exemplified by the Italian "Red Brigades" or the Baader-Meinhof "Red Army Fraction" in West Germany persists and has become to a certain extent more active.

All these currents, like Maoism and Trotskyism, enjoy some support from official bourgeois ideology, as an alternative to Marxism-Leninism. Their efforts to distort and belittle the gains made by real socialism in the Soviet Union and the socialist community countries are widely publicised in the Western press and are used by overt anti-communists in their attempts to prove the "pluralism" of Marxism in the 20th century.

Let us briefly describe the current of "anarcho-Marxism" which claims some use of Marxist ideas in its ideology and practice. These small groups, often numbering no more than a few members in various countries, take part in the most active discussion of the problems of the scientific and technological revolution and material production. Rejecting the terror and violence preached by the extremist groups, they maintain that the progress of the productive forces leads to man's enslavement, as the concentration of production (irrespective of the kind of ownership) suppresses the initiative of the masses. To build "free socialism", they want to reject the patterns existing in capitalist and socialist countries alike, so as to "find an entirely new social, technical and natural model".[30] This demagogic conception reflects the essence of petty-bourgeois mentality: ultra-revolutionary at times of social upheaval, and utterly pessimistic and ever-doubtful about the reality and success of the working people's daily struggle for better living conditions. Thus, these few individuals, exploiting Marxist terminology, prove utterly helpless when trying to scientifically assess the processes actually taking place, and reveal the futility of their views and the fact that they have no constructive goals or programme. This

is precisely why such ideas are praised by bourgeois ideology. From this, too, follows the correct assessment of these currents as tools of contemporary anti-Marxism and anti-Sovietism.

In describing the anti-Leninist petty-bourgeois ideological currents of today, it is necessary to mention yet another trend to come to public notice recently, the so-called "new philosophers" in France. Western journalists have dubbed them the New Right, by analogy with the New Left.

The first publications of these philosophers appeared in 1975. This was when André Glucksmann's *La Cuisiniere et le mangeur d'hommes* (Cook and the Cannibal) attracted attention. In 1977, another book by Glucksmann, *Les maîtres penseurs* (The Thinking Fathers) came out. Also in 1977, Glucksmann's fellow-thinker Bernard-Henri Lévi published his *La Barbarie à visage humain* (Barbarism with a Human Face). These were not isolated writings. About the same time there appeared *L'Ange : pour une cinégétique du semblant* (The Angel) by Guy Lardreau and Christian Jambet, *Dieu est Dieu, nom de Dieu!* (God is God, Goddammit!), and *Nous l'avons tous tue ou "Ce juif de Socrate* (This Jew Socrates) by Maurice Clavel, etc. Their authors, as a rule, had been active in the student demonstrations of 1968 which chanted, of course, the slogans of the New Left. Disenchantment with the ideas of Marcuse and Cohn-Bendit sent them rebounding over in their diametrically opposite direction, the camp of the ultra-right.

The New Right sets out to prove that Marxism leads to the violent suppression of the individual and must therefore be repudiated. It is significant that in his first book Glucksmann debates this point above all with regard to Lenin. The object of this debate is to substantiate the viewpoint that revolution never brings any progress or good for man. Therefore one should treat history pessimistically, rather than optimistically. The New Right extols the slanderous writings of Solzhenitsyn who heaps mud on the people that have repudiated him. Simultaneously they try to compromise the very idea of socialism, calling it an "absurd dream".

The "new philosophy" of these people amounts, in fact, to a call to reject revolution, the development of science

and the significance of reason in social progress. Instead, the New Right promotes irrationalism, mysticism, and the Nietzschean theory of "overmen" who should, according to them, rule others. This is a theory with a neo-fascist slant.

Thus the struggle of Marxism-Leninism against petty-bourgeois radical theories discloses this typical characteristic of the current struggle of ideas. Having suffered defeat in its overt attacks on Leninism, bourgeois ideology increasingly disguises itself with diverse radical and petty-bourgeois conceptions.

3. Leninism and the Philosophy of Social Reformism

Social reformism traces its descent from the Second International. At the beginning of the First World War, speaking of the causes that had brought about the collapse of the Second International, Lenin pointed out that after they had embraced social-chauvinism, its leaders had to altogether reject Marx's philosophical materialism and revolutionary dialectics. The sorry history of social reformism in the period between the first and second world wars is well known. The Social-Democratic rulers of the Weimar Republic cleared the way for the Nazis to come to power with their policy of class conciliation and their refusal to defend the interests of the German working class. Right-wing socialists in France and Italy and the Labour Party in Britain became the most convenient force for the imperialist bourgeoisie of these countries, obediently carrying out the orders of this bourgeoisie.

In 1977 a special seminar devoted to Marx was organised in Trier (West Germany). The theme of the seminar, "Freedom and Socialism," served as a screen for an utter negation of the ideas of the founder of scientific socialism and dialectical materialism. The chairman of the Socialist International Willy Brandt stated at the seminar: "To speak today of a special science of Marxism makes especially little sense when one fully honours the greatness of the scientific achievement in its time ... it [Marxism—*Ed.*] gradually lost its effectiveness in the interpretation dispute, until decades later, partly in other social classes, it experienced a renaissance which had become fairly independent of the truthfulness of the originally scientific theori-

es." [31] There is nothing one can add to this candid self-evaluation of contemporary social reformism. A denial of Marxism, an orientation towards the non-proletarian sections of society, and a reliance on non-Marxist ideological doctrines are the social and theoretical roots of contemporary social reformism.

Social reformists usually cite two principal arguments to justify their negative assessment of Marxism. The first is that the demand for ideological unity runs counter to the freedom of true socialists. The second is that as people are dissimilar, it is altogether impossible to evolve a common world outlook and, consequently, one cannot speak of common historical laws, a common scientific world outlook, ideological unity, etc.

What, then, is at the basis of contemporary social reformism? What political and social ends does it pursue? These questions were answered quite frankly and unequivocally by Willy Brandt in his speech, "Future Tasks of the International," delivered at the 13th Congress of the Socialist International, held in 1977. He said that the "principle of the self-determination of citizens against capitalist ... and communist collectivism" must underly the ideology of the Social-Democrats. "People like me," he noted, "long ago renounced the outdated utopia of shaping the 'new man'. What we work and struggle for is the survival of a man and humanity." [32] Thus, the struggle against all kinds of collectivism is not the creation of the new but the preservation of the old ("survival") by every possible means—this is what is inscribed today on the banner of social reformism.

We know how much was done by the world communist movement to unite all the efforts of workers' parties in the struggle against imperialism and fascism. In 1935, Georgi Dimitrov addresseed the 7th Congress of the Communist International with a speech "The Nazi Offensive and the Tasks of the Communist International in the Struggle for the Unity of Workers Against Nazism." He showed that the Nazis had been able to come to power solely because the workers were split, owing to the class conciliation policies of the Social-Democratic leaders.

After World War II major social reformist leaders openly said that they did not consider Marxism to be the theoretical basis of their policy. Benedict Kautsky, one of those

behind the programme of the Socialist Party of Austria which was adopted after the war, wrote in 1958: "We want to create a programme that will be fully and wholly subscribed to by both a Marxist and a non-Marxist, as well as an atheist, and a religious socialist." [33] Theoreticians of the "democratic socialism" of the 1950s and 1960s tried hard to justify the "legitimacy" of such ideological eclecticism. But these attempts to undermine Marxism's international influence came up against the historical fact that the successes of world socialism, in spite of the social reformists' efforts to the contrary, attracted the attention and sympathies of ever broader sections of progressive mankind all over the world. In the 1970s, the social reformists increasingly reverted to the question of the attitude they should take to Marxism and Leninism, as a stage in the development of Marxism in the new historical epoch.

In 1977, a Spanish socialist journal published an editorial on *Marxism as a Method*. It read: "Marxism is our methodology for studying history, the means by which are determined the strategy of the present struggle and the strategy of educating society in the direction of socialism." [34] Similar phenomena pointing to a "Marxist renaissance" in the social reformist press have become more frequent in recent years. Still, it would be a gross mistake to view this as a qualitative shift in the ideology of social reformism.

On taking a closer look at these "Marxist" statements, if one can call them such, one sees that what is designated as "Marxism" in them is usually Bernsteinianism. At the Trier seminar Brandt said: "Attention has been drawn in recent years to the in many respects remarkable modernity of Bernstein's work." [35] Many Social-Democrats are now trying to revive Bernstein's theory in their speeches and writings as an "operative methodology designed by Bernstein", to counter Leninism. [36]

The main thing here is the attitude taken to Leninism. The experience of the revolution in Russia, the building of socialism in the Soviet Union and the fraternal countries of the world socialist community, the drawing together of the socialist world with the national liberation and anti-imperialist struggles of the peoples of the young national states and the still remaining colonies and oppressed nations—all this discloses the real force of Lenin's ideas, their

vitality and their historical truth. All this has made Leninism today the strongest ideological force of the present. It is against this force that social reformist leaders level their attacks.

True, they do it nowadays with less coarseness and vulgarity than one finds, for instance, in K. Kautsky's 1918-1919 slanderous writings on the October Revolution or in the writings and speeches of right-wing socialists in the cold war period. Furthermore, the contemporary theoreticians of social reformism often pay homage to Leninism and the historical experience of real socialism. Thus, the left-wing Labour weekly *Tribune* wrote: "No one can or should deny the enormous impact of the 1917 Russian Revolution on the development of the world, both in economic and in social terms. There is much in the Soviet Union which may act as a guide to what must be done." [37] Discussing the role and place of communism in the world today, the Italian socialist Gino Bianco said that communism started with Lenin, "so one has to ask oneself what is going to happen to the Leninist perspective and the Leninist characteristics which were at the basis of the organisation and ... transformation of these parties of European communists". [38] This recognition of the importance of Leninism is highly significant. Even its social reformist opponents cannot now deny the fact that the world communist movement is carrying out the ideas of Leninism, as it always has been, that Lenin's predictions are at the basis of communist party activity today. The implicit meaning of such statements is different from their wording. This bowing and scraping to Leninism merely allows the social reformists to further weigh up the known differences in the communist movement as evidence for the withdrawal of certain communist parties from Leninism. In this connection, Bianco asserts that "while the communist ideology is falling to pieces, the emergence of Eurocommunist revisionism shows growing strength and the increased power of attraction of democratic socialism". [39]

Such statements are frequent in the social reformist publications of various countries. To quote an example, a member of the Labour Party Left, Fenner Brockway, wrote in *Tribune:* "The concentration of criticism on the Soviet Union is often based on ideological antagonism to its revolution .... But it has ended capitalism; all wealth pro-

duction belongs to the people. And it has achieved a marvellous transformation from a primitive society to a modern scientifically oriented society." Again, there is first an appeal for objective assessment and for facts bearing this out. And what comes next? This conclusion: "The Soviet Union is not a democratic socialist society".[40] The number of such instances could be multiplied many times over.

To sum up, the general ideological evolution of social reformism in the 20th century falls into three periods—the right-wing revisionist theories of Bernstein and K. Kautsky in the early decades, the complete renunciation of Marxism (Benedikt Kautsky, Leon Blum, Kurt Schumacher, and others) in the 1940s and 1950s, and, since the 1960s, a Marxist "renaissance", which criticises Leninism and real socialism, in the ideology of the major European Social-Democratic parties. Taking this approach, they warm over Bernstein's ideas, long buried by history, and utilise the theories propounded in bourgeois Marxology which makes Marx into an abstract humanist and contrasts him to Lenin and Leninism.

All that has been said above gives an idea of the complex nature of the Marxist-Leninist attitude to social reformist philosophy. Leninist Communists never forget for a moment that Social-Democratic parties still include a considerable number of working people, above all, the proletariat of the developed capitalist countries. Therefore, not only do the Communists not reject political contacts with the Social-Democrats, but they strive in every possible way towards a unity of action between the Communists and Socialists in fighting outright advocates of capitalism. At the same time, in the area of theory and philosophy, any kind of compromise is out of the question. In this respect Marxists-Leninists are carrying on a consistent struggle against social reformism, appearing at present as a form of the petty-bourgeois ideology used by the ruling classes of the capitalist countries as a way to split the working-class movement, carrying on their own class policy within it, and subjecting it to their own ideological influence.

Marxists-Leninists in the Soviet Union and other countries consistently criticise the philosophical principles of social reformism.

It was pointed out at the 25th CPSU Congress that the communist movement had notably expanded its contacts with the socialist and Social-Democratic parties of a number of countries including Finland, Belgium, Japan, Great Britain and France. In 1979, Moscow was visited by a Socialist International delegation which held productive talks with the CPSU leadership on unity of action in the struggle for peace and social progress.

Certain Social-Democratic party leaders, especially those in government, are looking for ways to strengthen contacts with the socialist community, the staunchest force in the struggle against the arms race and the forces of extreme imperialist reaction, the staunchest force for peace and peaceful economic competition between the world systems of socialism and capitalism.

Thus, defining the ideological positions of contemporary social reformism, in an article entitled "Social Democracy Is the Goal", the leader of the Socialist Party of Austria Bruno Kreisky, the Chancellor of the Republic of Austria declared in 1978: "... this process of the extensive democratisation of society, the realisation of social democracy, ... is never at an end."[41] But it is, so far, not quite clear what social democracy (or democratic socialism) is. As for Marx, he, according to Kreisky, "undertook an attempt to describe and explain the capitalist economic system".[42] And, besides, "neither Marx nor Engels, nor the early Lenin for that matter, imagined that Russia would be the first socialist state in the world, and, in fact, it has not become one to this day".[43] There is no difference between modern capitalism and socialism; it is merely a matter of different forms, not content. Such, briefly, are Kreisky's ideas.

He is echoed by Bettino Craxi, the National Secretary of the Italian Socialist Party and Vice-Chairman of the Socialist International. He says that socialism is fundamentally pluralistic. Contrary to Leninism (and therefore to Marxism), which contains a clear definition of the features of socialism as the first phase of the communist social formation, Craxi argues that there has been no uniform conception of socialism in the history of socialist thought. He rejects collectivism and proletarian internationalism, which are at the basis of Marx's and Lenin's doctrine, instead advocating pluralism of social relations and institu-

tions. From this also ensue his virulent attacks on Leninism and scientific communism. "Leninism and pluralism are antithetical terms: if the former prevails, the latter dies," he writes. [44]

This is how Craxi formulates the aim of social reformism: "If we want to proceed towards socialist pluralism, we should move in the direction opposite to that indicated by Leninism: we should spread the economic, political and cultural power as much as possible." [45]

There is something similar in the speeches and writings of the other political and ideological leaders of modern social reformism. They all try, in one way or another, to discard the experience of the October Revolution and the Soviet Union in defining the path to socialism. In what these "socialists" say, the very notion of socialism is increasingly lost, while the notion of communism is, foreseeably, not there at all. Thus what we are witnessing is a complete renunciation of Marx's ideas.

It is increasingly evident that the role of social reformism at the current stage is to fulfil a social order given by the imperialist bourgeoisie which wants to implant its own views of social processes in the working-class movement of their countries, using the theory and practice of the social reformist parties. This was why the 25th CPSU Congress pointed out: "Certainly, there can be no question of any ideological convergence between scientific communism and the reformism of the Social-Democrats. There are still too many among the Social-Democrats who base their entire activity on anti-communism and anti-Sovietism". [46] The Congress stressed that Communists should resolutely combat these things, because they only play into the hands of reactionaries.

The Communists denounce the policy of the right Social-Democrats, directed at a reconciliation with imperialists, at the so-called Atlantic solidarity and the arms race, and at the same time, as was emphasised at the 26th CPSU Congress, "actively support all steps useful to peace and democracy. In view of the present complication of the international situation, we attach importance to cooperation with Social-Democrats, trade unions, religious circles, and all democratic and peace-loving forces in the matter of preventing war and strengthening peace." [47] Basing its activity on Marxist-Leninist theory, the world communist mo-

vement has always displayed initiative and good will in this respect.

However, the Communists sharply criticised the ideological foundations of the right Social-Democrats as reformist and aimed at a reconciliation with imperialism or, rather, at an ideological subordination of the working class to the bourgeoisie. This ideological line of social-reformism was criticised in Lenin's works. His position on this issue remains directive in the entire struggle of Marxists-Leninists against the ideology of social-reformism in our day.

4. Leninism and Modern Revisionism

Revisionist distortions of Marxist philosophical thought have repeatedly been criticised by Leninists during the 20th century. At the beginning of his theoretical work, Lenin devoted much strength and energy to exposing the neo-Kantian revision of Marxism proposed by E. Bernstein and his followers. At this time, when the world had entered the epoch of imperialism and proletarian revolutions, it was necessary to restore the true revolutionary meaning of Marx's and Engels' doctrine on the material world and the objective laws of its development, and to disprove the sophistical and eclectic theories of Bernsteinianism, which provided the basis for social reformist and opportunist strategies and tactics in the Second International.

Later on, after the defeat of the first Russian revolution of 1905-1907, Lenin gave an exhaustive critical evaluation of "second wave" revisionism in his *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism.* This tried to revise the ideas of Marxism from the standpoint of the subjective idealism of Mach's philosophy. Lenin defended and further developed Marx's ideas on the active role of human knowledge in the practical remaking of the world and disclosed the partisan, class character of philosophical knowledge and its unity with social practice.

"Third-wave" revisionism emerged in international Marxist thought after the victorious Great October Socialist Revolution, when the Soviet people, led by the Communist Party, launched the building of a socialist society. At this time, Marxism-Leninism was revised from two directions—

the Hegelianist, on the one hand, and the neo-positivist, on the other. Lenin, and subsequently his followers, waged a philosophical struggle on two fronts—against attempts at interpreting Marxist philosophy merely as a theory of the human consciousness, a science of the forms of thought; and against the philosophical reductionism of the positivists, who sought to reduce the role of philosophy to the extent essential only for tackling specific problems while denying the dialectical content, common to all processes, of universal development. All these stages in the struggle against international revisionism led in the early 1930s to clarification of the main range of problems to be tackled at the Leninist stage of Marxist philosophy, which Marxists-Leninists in the Soviet Union and other countries then began to analyse comprehensively. Yet, as further developments made clear, the struggle against revisionism did not end there by any means.

After the victory over Nazi Germany in World War II, the peoples of a number of countries in Europe and Asia, and then in Latin America too, joined the struggle for socialism. In the late 1940s and early 1950s, a world socialist system emerged. The same period saw the collapse of world colonialism. In place of the former possessions of world imperialism in Asia, Africa, Oceania, and the American continent, young national states appeared and the oppressed peoples' anti-imperialist struggle for independent economic, political, and spiritual development was launched on a mass scale. Many of these young states chose the non-capitalist path, setting themselves the aim of building the foundations of a socialist society. These processes were visual and practical proof of the historical truth of Marxism-Leninism, which had predicted their coming long before their actual occurrence. In the area of ideology, they led to further growth in the world prestige of Leninism and the progressive contingents of mankind under its banner were further strengthened. Leninism became, at the beginning of the latter half of the 20th century, the strongest and most influential ideological current of world social thought. This fact was not slow in affecting the methods used by the anti-communist forces to resist the spread of Leninist ideas. Defeated in an open struggle against Leninism, the opponents of scientific communism applied the weapon they had always used at

moments of crisis, setting off a fresh wave of revisionism.

It is true that since the end of the 1970s and the beginning of the 1980s, this trend can only tentatively be described as revisionist. The point is that nearly all the exponents of the ideas referred to have long ceased to be revisionists in the true sense. After coming out at first with so-called corrections "within the framework of Marxist-Leninist theory", they soon left no doubt about their complete withdrawal from Marxism-Leninism and their rift with the practice of world communism and real socialism, and sided with imperialist reactionaries. These former revisionists should nowadays simply be called the renegades of the communist movement and the paid agents of imperialist reaction.

Leninism has had to engage in a serious struggle of ideas with this current ever since the mid-1950s. It would be well, therefore, to examine this struggle methodically in all its main directions.

A few words need to be said about the development of the Marxists-Leninists' struggle against philosophical revisionism in the 1950s and 1960s. At that time, revisionism showed two trends sufficiently distinct to be singled out. One of them can be described as Hegelianist-epistemological. It has its source in a book by Georg Lukács, *History and Class-Consciousness,* published in 1922. This book, subsequently severely criticised by a number of Marxists-Leninists and even by the author himself (see above), was forgotten for a long time in world Marxist thought. And suddenly—though in fact as was only to be expected—at the time when the world socialist community was forming, his ideas became popular again as an alternative to Leninism amongst certain Marxist sections. At first, these ideas were promoted by the "Petőfi Circle" in Hungary, just before the 1956 counter-revolutionary putsch. These ideas were galvanised as part of an attempt to depict the history of social thought not as a struggle between materialism and idealism, dialectics and metaphysics, but as the struggle of reason and irrationalism, i.e. the denial of reason. From this it was concluded that the Communists should limit their efforts to struggling for the minds of the working people, that is, they should engage in purely educational activities, separating philosophy from politics and

practice. In effect, thus, they preached a denial of the leading role of the communist parties in building socialism and communism.

Later on, by the mid-1960s, some revisionist writers supplemented this conception with structuralist ideas, structuralism being a fashionable idealist philosophical current which put external, structural relations at the basis of the world's existence and movement and man's knowledge of it. Thus in his hefty *Dialectics of the Concrete,* a Czechoslovak revisionist, Karel Kosík, put forward the idea of a subjectivist understanding of practice, excluding from philosophical analysis the question of the objective logic and material unity of the things around us. Kosík, just like his fellow-thinkers Mihailo Marković (Yugoslavia), Leszek Kolakowski (Poland) and others, has revised the principal ideas of Marx and Lenin on matter, the laws of its existence, the nature of dialectical reflection, and the unity of knowledge and social practice.

The other most recent revisionist trend is defined by the Marxists-Leninists as abstract anthropological. Its main exponents are the philosophers associated with the *Praxis* magazine and Korčula philosophical school (Yugoslavia). The chief representatives of this school are Gajo Petrović, Predrag Vranicki, Rudi Supek and others. They allege that in the history of Marxism, even in the 19th century, there were two distinct opposing trends. One of them, formulated in the early works of Marx, was "naturalism-humanism" or a criticism of the social conditions of man's life. The other, associated with the works of Engels and Lenin, was "scientism" or an attempt to relate the development of philosophy to the accumulation of scientific knowledge in general.

"Naturalism-humanism", when philosophy is not a science but an ideology criticising the existing conditions of human life irrespective of what material relations it is determined by, is regarded by these philosophers as "true". Leninism, on the other hand, is considered by them to be "false", as it replaces philosophy with a "scientistic" approach (i.e. it deals with scientific problems). The purpose of this attempt to exclude philosophy from the range of scientific disciplines was to disarm the world communist movement ideologically, depriving it of the theoretical base provided by Marx and Lenin and thorough-

ly tested by the practice of history in the past century.

During the 1960s, these conceptions were discussed by a number of revisionist philosophers in various countries, whose sole and as good as avowed purpose was to distort and falsify the Leninist stage in Marxist philosophy and substitute for Leninism in the communist movement one idealistic theory of bourgeois origins or another. Three such attempts are sufficiently representative to be singled out. These are the books on Leninism by Mehamed Filipović (Yugoslavia), Roger Garaudy (France), and Ernst Fischer and Franz Marek (Austria).

Lenjin. Monografija njegove misli (Lenin. A Monograph on His Thought) by Filipović, published in 1968, was immediately hailed by the Western bourgeois press as one of most complete and objective descriptions of Leninism. What is it about? Filipović begins by saying that all the other assessments of Lenin made in Marxist literature before him are "biased" and "distorted." By "distortion" he is referring to "Stalin's definition of Leninism, recently supplemented with a thesis on the 'Leninist stage in the development of Marxism' ".[48] Consequently, the relationship and continuity of Marxism and Leninism are, for Filipović, the main "fault" in Marxist assessments of Leninism.

What, then, is Filipović's view of Leninism? This, says the book, is a "special system or theoretical methodological whole within Marxism."[49] And this system turns out to be a sum of Hegelianism, subjectivism, and materialism. There is no mention of the relation between this and the Marxist conception of the unity of dialectics and materialism, the critical views of Hegel, and Lenin's exposure of the subjectivist theories (e.g., Narodism, Machism, social-chauvinism, etc.).

Starting from this arbitrary scheme, Filipović advocates "overcoming mystification within the Marxist trend, the so-called Stalinised Leninism, which, besides, claims the right to be the sole interpreter of Lenin and Leninism."[50] This "falsification", according to Filipović, may be "overcome" through finding evidence of Lenin's "contemplative", Feuerbachian, attitude to nature, allegedly typical of the "first phase" of Lenin's philosophical development, and Hegelianism, characterising the "second phase" of his development. It must be added that Filipović describes as the "first phase" the years when Lenin worked at *Mate-*

rialism and Empirio-Criticism, and the "second" when he worked at his *Philosophical Notebooks.* In the light of the facts cited in the preceding chapters, these purely arbitrary inventions are hardly worth serious consideration.

Another similar publication of the 1960s is R. Garaudy's *Lénine* [51] published in Paris in 1968. Roger Garaudy, who was for many years a member of the French Communist Party and was in its Central Committee, at one time repeatedly expressed his devotion to the ideas of Leninism. In 1949, he published an article, "Lénine et la philosophie" (Lenin and Philosophy), where he wrote that Leninism was the Communists' ideological weapon and that "in the changed conditions of the class struggle this weapon, which has lost nothing of its edge but has become sharper in the course of the forty-year struggle and victories of the working class, permits us to wage the battle with determination on the ideological front". [52] Twenty years after, he published an openly anti-Leninist book in which he tried to pervert commonly known facts to fit them into his arbitrary scheme, falsifying the essence of Lenin's philosophical work. His book on Lenin has three sections: (1) a biography of Lenin, (2) an assessment of Leninism, and (3) separate quotations from Lenin's works.

Even in the first section Garaudy garbles the facts, claiming that Lenin did not engage in philosophical problems as a theoretician. According to Garaudy, he turned to certain problems of philosophy as a politician and practician. Further on, he divides Lenin's philosophical work into three periods: 1894-1905—an analysis of the historical features of Russian reality and criticism of petty-bourgeois theories, this activity being almost entirely influenced by Kautsky's and Plekhanov's ideas. Next: 1905-1914—generalising from the lessons of the 1905 revolution, a materialist interpretation of scientific data. The ideas of Engels and a break with Kautsky and Plekhanov formed the theoretical basis for this. The third period: 1914-1924—an analysis of the problems of imperialism, criticism of opportunism and a study of the problems of the state, democracy, and humanism. Hegel's ideas underlie this period of Lenin's thought.

To sum up, in the first period of his philosophical work Lenin, for Garaudy, is a Kautskyite; in the second, he carries on Engels' "scientistic" line; in the third, he is a He-

gelian. The independent substance of Leninism, therefore, just evaporates into nowhere.

Marxist philosophers have stated facts in hand to show how discretionary and subjective Garaudy's propositions are.[53] Even at the start of his revolutionary career, while defending the purity of Marxist philosophy, Lenin was far from making absolutes of Kautsky's and Plekhanov's ideas, and in some instances criticised them quite sharply and convincingly. If we are to believe Garaudy, the "culmination" of Lenin's philosophical development is his study of Hegel which he pursued, according to Garaudy, between 1914 and 1916. But it is well known that at the end of the 19th century Lenin had made a thorough study of Hegel and often cited him in his works.

Garaudy's book is hardly original and its main points reiterate the falsifications of Leninism made by bourgeois and petty-bourgeois "Leninologists". His book shows once again how the anti-Leninist positions of contemporary revisionism link up with the ideology of the enemies of Marxism-Leninism.

A third book on Lenin, which gained some prominence in the revisionist literature of the 1960s, was *Was Lenin WIRKLICH sagte* (What Lenin Really Said) written by the Austrian revisionists E. Fischer and F. Marek and published in 1969. In a book published a year before, *Was Marx WIRKLICH sagte* (What Marx Really Said), Fischer wrote: "Leninism was the name given in Lenin's lifetime to the views of the group in Russian Social-Democracy (the Bolsheviks) which Lenin led."[54] This already clearly indicates that the author is either ignoring the facts or deliberately distorting them. As was shown in the preceding chapters, Lenin would not have the word "Leninism" used anywhere as long as he lived. Quite apart from this, in the middle of the 1920s, Lenin's supporters made up not only the Bolshevik Party in Russia, but also a number of revolutionary groups in many countries of Europe. Between 1918 and 1921 these groups gave rise, in many countries of the world, to the communist parties which formed the Third Communist International as early as 1919. And Leninism was the name applied to the general line in the development of Marxist theory, which was the ideological basis of the October Revolution and the entire world communist movement of the current epoch.

In their book on Lenin, Fischer and Marek propound the idea—which has entered the workers' movement from bourgeois ideology—that Lenin was a practician rather than a theoretician. The principal method in use here is to distinguish Marx the philosopher from Lenin the politician. "Marx was, in spite of his leading role in the International Working Men's Association, above all a theoretician," write the authors, "Lenin, in spite of his theoretical works, was above all a strategist and the tactician of the revolution." [55] It is easy to see that this allegation reiterates the revisionist ideas of the 1920s and, on a wider plane, repeats the social-reformist opportunistic dogma which contrasts revolutionary practice with scientific theory.

Fischer and Marek write at length on how Lenin applied the precepts of Marxism to Russian reality. Note the word "applied". Ever since the start of the ideological struggle against Lenin, all his opponents have gone out of their way to prove that the ideas put forward by Lenin contained nothing new or original. The content of Leninism was interpreted entirely as the application or utilisation of other people's ideas (those of Marx, Engels, Kautsky, Plekhanov, and so forth).

Leninism, for Fischer and Marek, is marked specifically by its "insufficient" use of the Marxist theory of social determinism, which, they maintain, indicates the "voluntarism" of Lenin's ideas, and, secondly, by trying to justify the peasants' involvement in the proletarian revolution. Of course Lenin raised the development of Marxist ideas on the significance of the subjective factor in history to a new and higher level. But this was not an "underestimation" of determinism but a more profound understanding of it. It is also true that Lenin devoted much attention to the agrarian question and the problem of the peasants' participation in the proletarian revolution. But let us recall Marx's well-known propositions from *The 18th Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte,* in which it was stated that the proletariat should draw the peasants into its own struggle. Marx based his theory of the social revolution on these ideas. During the emergence of developed capitalism, Marx wrote, the peasants "find their natural ally and leader in the *urban proletariat,* whose task is the overthrow of the bourgeois order". [56] This Marxist proposition was adopted by Lenin and developed with reference to the experience

of the 20th-century revolutions (primarily, of course, the Russian revolution, but far from this alone).

The writings by Fischer and Marek, like all the other similar attacks on Leninism in the 1960s, brought their authors neither fame nor any palpable results; they failed to reduce the attention paid by the world public to Leninism. On the contrary, the prestige of Lenin's ideas among ever broader sections, of the working people in different countries keeps growing. This is due, above all, to the fact that more and more of Lenin's theoretical predictions have been coming true in the specific history of our time. On the basis of Lenin's ideas, the CPSU and the fraternal communist and workers' parties all over the world determine the long-range and current objectives of the struggle of all progressive mankind for peace and the happiness of all people on earth. Lenin's theoretical legacy, whatever the revisionists say, is at present the sole scientific theory, and one which is the most consistent with the real interests and hopes of the common people in bringing about the most equitable and humane social relations, those of the socialist and communist type.

The anti-Leninist writings considered above refer to the so-called revisionism of the right, that is, to attempts to revise Marxist-Leninist theory from the standpoint of class conciliation, of injecting the working-class movement with ideas defending and justifying capitalism. As has repeatedly been pointed out at the international meetings of representatives of communist and workers' parties (in 1957, 1960 and 1969), this kind of revisionism presents the chief danger to the Marxists-Leninists' ideological struggle for the purity and development of their doctrine.

"Left-wing" revisionism, that is, distortion of communist ideas from the standpoint of petty-bourgeois radicalism, has also made sallies against Marxism-Leninism in the course of its development. A certain threat to Marxism-Leninism was presented in the 1960s by Maoism, which is a kind of "left-wing" revisionism. Maoism implies the negation of all the preceding development in Marxism-Leninism, which it sought to replace with the nationalist megalomaniac ideas of the Mao Zedong group. Maoism has rejected such fundamental principles of Marxist-Leninist theory as the doctrine on the world historic role of the working class and proletarian internationalism, Lenin's

theory on the party of a new type, the doctrine on the objective laws of building socialism, and so on. Instead of studying the facts, taking into account the operation of the objective laws of world development, applying the advances of science and technology, and developing in every way the socialist way of life and socialist consciousness, Maoism has demanded blind faith in the infallibility of its leaders and absolute passive submission of the masses to their bidding.

Maoism has never been backed up by clear theoretical, philosophical principles. Demagogically exploiting Marxist terminology, it actually proclaims a renunciation of dialectical materialism and scientific communism, reducing all contradictions to purely external conflicts, to be resolved by force of arms. Owing to its bellicose anti-humanism, its contemptuous attitude to man and the working people in general, and its political unscrupulousness, Maoism quickly turned from being a "left-wing" revisionist trend into a frankly anti-Marxist, anti-Leninist current which, under the guise of pseudo-revolutionism, seeks to find allies amongst the Chilean and South African fascists, Israeli nationalists, US imperialists and other forces of most extreme reaction in the world. While stating the Soviet people's readiness to normalise relations with China, the 25th CPSU Congress simultaneously declared in no uncertain terms that the Maoists' policy "is not only entirely alien to socialist principles and ideals, but has also, in effect, become an important aid to imperialism in its struggle against socialism". [57]

The struggle of Leninism against any revision in the communist world outlook, as well as against bourgeois ideology as a whole, is today the paramount task to which Communists all over the world must dedicate their entire ideological activities.

---

[1] G. A. Wetter, *Der dialektische Materialismus, Seine Geschichte und sein System in der Sowjetunion,* Verlag Herder, Vienna, 1958, pp. 627-628.

[2] M. Merleau-Ponty, *Les aventures de la dialectique,* Paris, 1955, p. 273.

[3] *Ibid.,* p. 47.

[4] *Ibid.,* p. 279.

[5] See S. Hook, "What's Left of Karl Marx?" *Saturday Review,* 1956, No. 6, p. 58.

[6] S. Hook, *Marx and the Marxists,* D. Van Nostrand Co., New York, 1955, p. 3.
[7] *Ibid.,* p. 92.
[8] J.-P. Sartre, *Critique de la raison dialectique,* Paris, 1960, p. 22.
[9] See R. Aron, *Le développement de société industrielle et la stratification sociale,* Paris, 1956, p. 25.
[10] K. Mehnert, *Peking und Moskau,* Deutsche-Verlag-Anstalt, 1962, S. 81.
[11] See A. Meyer, *Marxism. The Unity of Theory and Practice. A Critical Essay,* Harvard University Press, Cambridge, 1954.
[12] See R. N. Carew Hunt, *A Guide to Communist Jargon,* Geoffrey Bles, London, 1957.
[13] See Bibliography.
[14] V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works,* Vol. 31, pp. 39-46.
[15] *Ibid.,* p. 43.
[16] *Ibid.*
[17] *Ibid.*
[18] Theodor W. Adorno, *Negative Dialektik,* Frankfurt am Main, 1966, p. 147.
[19] M. Horkheimer, *Die gesellschaftliche Funktion der Philosophie,* Frankfurt am Main, p. 282.
[20] K. Marx, "Contribution to the Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Law". In: K. Marx, F. Engels, *Collected Works,* Vol. 3, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1975, p. 182.
[21] Theodor W. Adorno, *Negative Dialektik,* Frankfurt am Main, 1966, pp. 14-15.
[22] *Ibid.,* p. 142.
[23] *Ibid.*
[24] *Ibid.,* p. 144.
[25] *Ibid.*
[26] *Ibid.*
[27] *Ibid.,* pp. 144-145.
[28] See H. Marcuse, *Soviet Marxism. A Critical Analysis,* Columbia University Press, London, 1958.
[29] See Peter Lösche, *Anarchismus,* Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, Darmstadt, 1977, pp. 20-21.
[30] *Linksrevisionistische Verfölschungen der Wechselverhöltnisses von Produktivkröften und Produktionsverhältnissen,* Berlin (West), 1976, pp. 113-114.
[31] *Socialist Affairs,* London, July-August 1977, Vol. 27, No. 4, pp. 90-91.
[32] *Ibid.,* Vol. 27, No. 1, p. 8.
[33] *Arbeiter Zeitung,* Vienna, May 15, 1958.
[34] *Socialista,* Madrid, 1977, No. 1, p. 2.
[35] *Socialist Affairs,* July-August 1977, Vol. 27, No. 4.
[36] *Ibid.,* p. 88.
[37] *Tribune,* London, November 11, 1977, No. 45, p. 5.
[38] *Socialist Affairs,* September-October 1977, Vol. 27, No. 5, p. 120.
[39] *Ibid.,* p. 124.
[40] *Tribune,* November 11, 1977, No. 45, p. 7.
[41] *Die Neue Gesellschaft,* Bonn, No. 10, October 1978, p. 829.
[42] *Ibid.,* p. 830.
[43] *Ibid.,* p. 831.
[44] *Avanti!* August 23, 1978, p. 7.

[45] *Ibid.*
[46] L. I. Brezhnev, *Report of the CPSU Central Committee and the Immediate Tasks of the Party in Home and Foreign Policy,* Novosti Press Agency Publishing House, Moscow, 1976, p. 55.
[47] L. I. Brezhnev, *Report of the Central Committee of the CPSU to the XXVI Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Immediate Tasks of the Party in Home and Foreign Policy,* p. 33.
[48] Mehamed Filipović, *Lenjin. Monografija njegove misli,* Sarajevo, 1968, p. 15.
[49] *Ibid.*
[50] *Ibid.*, p. 138.
[51] R. Garaudy, *Lénine,* Presses universitaires de France, Paris, 1968.
[52] *Cahiers du communisme,* April 1949, No. 4, p. 462.
[53] See, for instance, J.-J. Goblot, *Sur la biographie intellectuelle de Lénine* (On an Intellectual Biography of Lenin) in *La pensée*, No. 143, February 1969, pp. 80-88; H. Momjan, *Marxism and the Renegade Garaudy,* Nauka Publishers, Moscow, 1974 (in Russian).
[54] Ernst Fischer, *Was Marx wirklich sagte,* Verlag Fritz Moldern, Vienna-Munich-Zurich, 1968, p. 158.
[55] E. Fischer, F. Marek, *Was Lenin wirklich sagte,* Verlag Fritz Molden, Vienna-Munich-Zurich, 1969, p. 11.
[56] K. Marx, "The 18th Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte", in Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, *Collected Works,* Vol. 11, p. 191.
[57] L. I. Brezhnev, *Report of the Central Committee of the CPSU to the XXVI Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Immediate Tasks of the Party in Home and Foreign Policy,* p. 18.

CONCLUSION

The path covered by Marxist-Leninist philosophical thought in the 20th century is indissolubly linked with the general progress of humanity towards socialism and communism. It would be incorrect to assert that Marxist-Leninist philosophy develops in this age smoothly and in a direct line. A sharp struggle, predicaments, errors and mistakes have all taken place. But to belittle the great positive contribution made into the theory of Marxism by Lenin, his disciples and followers, is to plunge into grave error or deliberately distort the content of this process.

At the Leninist stage, Marxist philosophy made a huge deposit into the treasure-house of world philosophical thought, further developing the main trend in modern scientific knowledge. Leninism has become widely recognised as the scientific-philosophical basis of the contemporary world revolutionary process and international communist movement, and is the prevailing ideology in the socialist community. The attraction and authority of Lenin's ideas for the progressive humankind are beyond any comparison.

Today Marxist-Leninist philosophy is the source of both revolutionary thought and revolutionary action. It discloses the basic laws of the modern period and arms all consistent fighters for social progress with the newest achievements made in practical activities and science.

Marxists-Leninists in all countries are staunchly upholding the principles underlying the unity of all true revolutionaries, creators of a new life.

This unity reposes on an utter dedication to the Leninist principles of the unity of theory and practice, proletarian internationalism, communist partisanship, irreconcilable ideological struggle against bourgeois ideology, social-reformist and revisionist theories. The truth and militant nature of these principles have been corroborated by the historical developments of our age.

Marxist-Leninist philosophy has fathomed the contemporary revolutionary process and the scientific and technical revolution. Scientific solutions to present-day global problems, which more and more often loom large before unbiassed investigators, are being found while using methods suggested by Lenin.

One of the most important functions of Marxist-Leninist philosophy is teaching the broad mass of the population to understand the summits of philosophical thought reached by the human genius which are most fully embodied in the science created by Marx and updated by Lenin.

The international communist movement, the resolutions and documents adopted at the recent CPSU Congresses and CC CPSU plenary meetings, have demonstrated the great relevance of Lenin's theoretical legacy at the present stage. Especially important in this respect are materials and decisions of the 26th CPSU Congress (1981). The Report to the Congress, made by CC CPSU General Secretary Leonid Brezhnev, emphasises that in ideological terms successes achieved by the international communist movement and building a new society in the USSR and the other socialist community countries repose on that "Communists, armed with the Marxist-Leninist teaching, see the essence and perspective of the processes in the world more profoundly and more correctly than anybody else, and draw the right conclusions from them for their struggle for the interests of the working class, the working people of their countries, and for democracy, peace and socialism".[1]

Over the 1970s, communist parties have been active in 94 countries of the world. More than 800,000 new members joined their ranks in Western Europe alone. The Communists have formed unions and multilateral connections with

[1] L. I. Brezhnev. *Report of the Central Committee of the CPSU to the XXVI Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Immediate Tasks of the Party in Home and Foreign Policy*, p. 31.

many political parties and alliances, which are pursuing in their countries anti-imperialist, democratic and peace-loving policies aimed at establishing truly equitable, democratic and human relations among the people and based on respect for the working masses, their requirements and interests. Relations of friendship and cooperation have been vividly demonstrated at the 26th CPSU Congress, which played host to 123 delegations of communist, workers', national-democratic and other parties and organisations of 109 countries from all continents of the globe.

This was yet another manifestation of the growing international prestige enjoyed by the CPSU—the party formed by Lenin, and Leninism—the only true teaching confirmed by the 20th-century historical events.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books on Philosophical Topics of Leninism (1920s-1970s)

Адоратский В. В., «Что такое марксизм-ленинизм», М., 1926.

Блохинцев Д. И. Ленинское учение о неисчерпаемости материи и современная физика.— В: «Великое произведение воинствующего материализма». Изд. АН СССР, М., 1959.

Быстрянский В., «Ленин как материалист-диалектик», Л., 1925.

Вавилов С. И., «Ленин и физика», «Наука», М., 1960.

Варьяш А. И., «Диалектика у Ленина», ОГИЗ, М.-Л., 1928.

Востриков А. В., «Борьба В. И. Ленина против неокантианской ревизии марксизма в России», Госполитиздат, М., 1949.

Горев Б. И., «От Томаса Мора до Ленина», М., 1922.

Горохов Ф. А., «Ленин и исторический материализм», Госполитиздат, М., 1958.

Деборин А., «Ленин как мыслитель», М., 1924.

Досев П. (Т. Павлов), «Теория отражения», ОГИЗ, М.-Л., 1936.

Иовчук М. Т., «Ленинизм, философские традиции и современность», «Мысль», 1970.

«История марксистской диалектики. Ленинский этап», под ред. Курсанова Г. А., «Мысль», М., 1973.

Керженцев П. М., «Ленинизм», М., 1925.

Косичев А. Д., «Борьба марксизма-ленинизма с идеологией анархизма и современность», изд. МГУ, М., 1964.

Крывелев И. А., «Ленин о религии», Госполитиздат, М., 1949.

Курсанов Г. А., «Ленинизм и кризис буржуазной философской мысли», «Мысль», М., 1971.

«Ленин как философ», под ред. Гизермана Г. Е. и др., «Мысль», М., 1969.

«Ленинизм и современность», Политиздат, М., 1969.

«Ленинизм и современные проблемы историко-философской науки», под ред. Суворова Л. Н. и др., «Наука», М., 1970.

«Ленинизм и управление социальными процессами при социализме», под ред. Степаняна Ц. А. и др., «Мысль», М., 1973.

«Ленинизм и философские проблемы современности», под ред. Иовчука М. Т., «Мысль», М., 1970.

«Ленинизм, история философии и современность», под ред. Иовчука М. Т., Партиздат, София, 1972.

«Ленинская теория отражения и современная наука», «Наука», М., 1966.

«Ленинская теория отражения и современность, тт I-III», Партиздат, Москва-София, 1973.

«Ленинская теория социалистической революции и современность», под ред. Федосеева П. Н. и др., Политиздат, М., 1972.

«Ленинский этап в развитии философии марксизма», «Наука», М., 1972.

Луппол И., «Ленин и философия», Л., 1924.

«Марксистско-ленинская философия и социология в СССР и европейских социалистических странах», под ред. Иовчука М. Т. и др., «Мысль», М., 1965.

Модржинская Е. Д., «Ленинизм и современная идеологическая борьба», «Наука», М., 1972.

Окулов А. Ф., «Борьба В. И. Ленина против философии реформизма и ревизионизма», «Мысль», М., 1959.

Розенталь М. М., «Ленин и диалектика», «Мысль», М., 1963.

Сидоров М. И., «В. И. Ленин и вопросы истории русской материалистической философии», Госполитиздат, М., 1962.

Суворов Л. Н., «Борьба В. И. Ленина против антимарксистских философских концепций в послеоктябрьский период», «Высшая школа», М., 1974.

Суворов Л. Н. «Борьба марксистско-ленинской философии в СССР против буржуазной идеологии и ревизионизма в переходный период от капитализма к социализму», Изд. МГУ, М., 1961.

Суворов Л. Н., «В. И. Ленин и методологические проблемы социального управления», «Наука», М., 1973.

Суворов Л. Н., «Вопросы диалектики в «Философских тетрадях» В. И. Ленина», Изд. МГУ, М., 1960.

Чагин Б. А., «Борьба марксизма-ленинизма против философского ревизионизма в конце XIX-начале XX века», Госполитиздат, Л., 1959.

Чагин Б. А., «Из истории борьбы В. И. Ленина за развитие марксистской философии», «Мысль», Л., 1960.

Щеглов А. В., «Борьба Ленина против богдановской ревизии марксизма", ОГИЗ, М., 1973.

Щеглов А. В., "Развитие марксистской философии в трудах В. И. Ленина", "Мысль", М., 1963.

Якушевский И. Т., "Ленинизм и 'советология'",'Наука", Л., 1970.

Ярославский Е. М., "Мысли Ленина о религии", М., 1924.

Bruhat, Y., *Lénine*, Editions Sociales, Paris, 1960.

Cachin, M., *Rencontre avec Lénine*, Editions Sociales, Paris, 1949.

Dutt, R. P., *Life and Teaching of V. I. Lenin*, New York, 1934.

Foster, W. Z., *Lenin, the Party of a New Type: History of the Three Internationals,* New York, 1955.

Sève, L., *Introduction au Léninisme,* Editions Sociales, Paris, 1960.

Schubardt, N., *Lenins Kampf gegen den philosophischen Revisionismus,* Dietz Verlag, Berlin, 1959.

Thorez, M., *Dans la voie de Lénine,* Editions Sociales, Paris, 1935.

Thorez, M., *Lénine et la France,* Editions Sociales, Paris, 1960.

Request to Readers

Progress Publishers would be glad to have your opinion of this book, its translation and design and any suggestions you may have for future publications.

Please send all your comments to 17, Zubovsky Boulevard, Moscow, USSR.

Л. Н. СУВОРОВ

Философия марксизма на ленинском этапе ее развития

На английском языке